

A unified theory of Art experience: Application to Music - I

By

R.Sathyanarayana

Let me, at the very outset, confess to a sense of trepidation and guilt in making this presentation along with Vidwan Nanda Kumar. For, it is beset with many limitations. To mention some of its constraints: it sets out to analyse and describe a category of experience viz. that of art, which is an indivisible whole and un-translatable. Methodological necessity compels me to divide the presentation into phases or aspects, as if the experience itself manifests in phases and postures. A second question is epistemological: Is art experience the same for all arts despite difference in physical and symbolic materials, method and technique? Is it qualitatively the same at different ethnic and cultural levels? Do we have mental tools to resolve these questions? A third question, especially relevant to the project on hand, is: whether experience of different arts qualitatively same or different? is it possible to construct a single theoretical model for aesthetic experience? Classical aesthetic theories in ancient and medieval India occupy themselves with drama and poetry. The concepts and constructs of such theories fail, by and large, to apply to music, dance and the visual arts in their respective autonomies. The symbolic materials of music, for example, are peculiar to it in its autonomy both in their semantic content and functions, thus suggesting a qualitative difference for musical experience.

WHAT IS SEMANTIC CONTENT ?

Before I venture an analytical study of the project, I should like to say a few words on the objectives of Indian art. Is art purely aesthetic in scope or is it didactic? *Alaṅkāraśāstra* and *Saṅgītaśāstra* have raised and answered this question again and again. Thus, Bharatamuni, who holds that *nāṭya* is a complex of all art forms (the words यदिहास्ति, तदन्यत्र, यत्रेहास्ति तत्र क्वचित् spring to the mind), repeatedly asserts that its purpose and function are *lokānucārita* and *lokopadeśajanana*. He calls its experience *nāṭyarasa* unequivocally. Abhinavagupta explains this further.

ननु किम् गुरुवदुवदेशं करोति नेत्यहं किन्तु बुद्धिम् विबन्धयति, स्वप्रतिभां एव सादृशिम् वितरतीत्यर्थः

For the most part *kāvyaśāstra* and *saṅgītaśāstra* are agreed that the purpose of art is to serve as an instrument to accomplish all four *puruṣārthas*. Thus, Bhāmaha:

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु वैचक्षण्यम् कलासु च ।

करोति कीर्तिम् प्रीतिम् च साधु काव्यनिबन्धनं ।

Mammaṭa says

काव्यम् यशसेऽर्थकृते व्यवहारविदे शिवेतरक्षतये ।

सध्यः परं निवृत्तये कान्तासम्मिततया उपदेशयुजे ॥

Śārngadeva says

धर्मार्थकाममोक्षणाम् इदं (=सङ्गीतं) एवैक साधनं ।

Thus, we begin our examinations by asserting that music and dancing can exist in both autonomous and heteronomous state. In their autonomy, i.e, in the absence of words and other metaphors they are non-referential and untranslatable in experience. In their heteronomy, i.e. when associated with words or other multi-disciplinal interactions, their experience is spread over a large area of human knowledge and activity. Music, for example, is interrelated to dancing, literature, painting, sculpture and architecture. These involve emotion at both source and destination: The emotion at the source is from the referential world; this emotion is abstracted, transformed, transposed or extrapolated at the destination. All these arts employ the same elements drawn from the phenomenal world viz. periodicity, rhythm, colour, shade, line, contour etc. These are transformed and structured into semantic patterns. The underlying meaning may be discursive or non-discursive.

Musical experience yields in its heteronomy metaphors in other aesthetic modes: imagery (poetry), colouration, texture, liner resolution etc (painting), concretisation or iconofication (sculpture), structuring and design (architecture), rhythms and dynamics (dancing) etc. Such abstracted metaphors are occasionally concretised in the human brain by cross channelling in synaesthetic experience.

These considerations suggest the possibility of an integrated or unified model of art experience. But, interdisciplinary and intradisciplinary correlation is still conspicuous by its absence in studies in Indian music. An experience which is essentially integral and largely untranslatable, pure music (non-associative music) in both performance and listening has many postures such as the aesthetic, creative, mathematical, physical, physiological, acoustical, behavioural, social and pedagogical. I view the project in the larger perspective.

The project on which we are all engaged has for its objective the construction of a general, integrated model of art experience which would explain the experience of every art individually and collectively. It is sometimes proposed in recent times that the aesthetic theory of *nāṭya* or of *kāvya* could be such a theory. It is pertinent to raise some questions while examining this proposal. First, *nāṭya* was originally conceived as being a *drśya kāvya* and *śravya kāvya* at the same time, i.e., audio-visual poetry. *Drśya kāvya* is *rūpaka* and *śravya kāvya* is its *vācīkābhīnaya*; each is supported by ancillary arts such as costumery and make-up, dancing, visual and graphic arts on the one hand and by the aural arts such as singing and instrumental music on the other. *Nāṭya* is thus, a complex of several art forms-the total theatre:

न तज्ज्ञनं न तच्छिल्पं न सा विद्या न सा कला ।

ना सौ योगो न तत् कर्म नाट्येऽस्मिन् यन्न दृश्यते ॥

The question is : could we enlarge the scope of the terms *kāvya* to include wordless aesthetic experience (this is directly contrary to Bharatamuni's often repeated assertion asserting that *nāṭya* is *vācīkābhīnaya pradhāna*), *śravya kāvya* to include wordless music and *drśya kāvya* to include wordless dance, that is, *nṛtta*?

A second question is: the quintessence of the aesthetic experience of *nāṭya* is focussed on the *vācīkābhīnaya* in *rūpaka*, while the contributions of the other arts to it are secondary. In fact, they stand in the relationship of *aṅgi* (whole) and *aṅgās* (parts). Bharatamuni gives two gustatory illustrations for this viz. *śāḍava* and *bhojana* in which the total experience is not the sum or the average of component experiences, but, that it is a whole, indivisible one, that the whole is greater than the sum of the parts. Thus, does what applies to the whole, apply to each part also, especially, when the part like wordless music and wordless dance, can exist in its own autonomy? How do the parts contribute to the unity of the whole? Bharatamuni is very much aware of this question. He answers with the analogy of the burning firebrand, the *alāta cakra*. Abhinavagupta expatiates on this. I have explained this at some length elsewhere. But it suffices here to say that the parts contribute to the illusion of unity and wholeness by performing two functions, namely centration and continuity, like the burning end of the firebrand while revolving in a circle. The question then is: is the wholeness of aesthetic experience - or of any experience as matter of fact, an illusion? Or is its wholeness a result of mutual coordination, consistency and organisation of the parts, as found in the relationship between the body and its organs (*avayavī* and *avayava*)? This question is valid for experience of *kāvya* also. This should be borne in mind when approaching a theory for art experience in general.

I am given the task of examining the possibility and feasibility of extending the elements *alanikāra* etc. of the aesthetic theory of *nāṭya* and of *kāvya* to music. Indian music is overwhelmingly word dominated, Karnāṭaka music more so than Hindusthāni music. Most instrumental music is modelled after vocal music. Musical forms which are not based on words are indeed very few. What are the mutual roles of music and words in such musical forms in composing, performance and listening? For the most part, music plays a secondary role, serving to suggest, stimulate, support, augment, simulate or emphasise word meaning and word emotion. Music employs many means such as *gamaka*, *kāku*, dynamics, legato, texture, exaggeration, emphasis and accent in order to accomplish this. If the composer is didactic or word-descriptive, if the performer approves it or is inspired by it and if the listener is not very musical, music takes a backseat. If, on the other hand, all three participants of the music experience are more music oriented, word content becomes secondary. One manifestation of this is the disregard shown by many performers to word content and its toleration by many listeners. There is another aspect to this situation: pure music or wordless music consists of items such as *ālāpanā*, *tānam* and *svarakalpana* or musical forms such as the *svarajati*, *jatisvara* and *tillana* (sometimes these also are composed with words!). these are relatively less popular amongst listeners because, while in music with words they can hang on to a reference offered by the words and enjoy the music as an integral part of the experience, they cannot do so in pure music. An extreme case of this is, of course, instrumental music in which the function of words is borne in mind by still fewer musicians and listeners. The proposed unified theory should thus accommodate both music with and without words.

We have so far considered only the most aesthetic of the varieties of music viz. the classical. The theory being sought should include the other varieties of music. Similarly, it should be constructed to cover analogues in other arts with and without phenomenal content (with and without words) and other varieties.

An important part of the discussion of the project is the evocation of emotion and nature of emotion in art experience. The nature of emotion in a musical experience and in other non-referential art forms merits a special consideration. This will be taken-up later in connection with the *Rasa* Theory.

The *kāvya rasa* theory embraces within itself all precedent theories or *prasthānas* of poetic experience viz. *alaṅkāra*, *rīti*, *guṇa*, *vakrokti*, *dhvani*, *rasa* and *aucitya* and became a homogenous whole because each was designed to include its predecessor/s, thus enlarging its scope. This became possible because the basis of poetic experience viz. *pada* (word) has two aspects, *śabda* (sound) and *artha* (meaning) and has trifold functions or qualities namely *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā*, and *vyañjanā*. It must be noted that pure music differs from *kāvya* because it has no word but its fundamental unit is *Svara* which has neither *śabda* nor *artha*, nor has it *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *vyañjanā* in the linguistic sense. If it is to be accommodated in the *kāvya rasa* theory, it can be done only by analogy, parallels or extrapolation. Because of the difference between the two just mentioned, analogy, parallels or extrapolation may not be real or natural but may have to be forced, unnatural or contrived. Thus the extension of the *kāvya rasa* theory would yield only a contrived, suited or artificial product, and not an original, *a priori* theory. This problem must be borne in mind in the formulation of a unified or common theory of art experience. The theory of experience of pure music would be based only on *Svara* and *laya* and the related paraphernalia. Again, the *kāvya rasa* is constituted of poetic images which are derived from the phenomenal world whereas a sound-rhythm image, if it exists, has no images or metaphors. I shall endeavour to show later that there are no analogues in musical experience for the components of *rasa* experience in the *nāṭya* experience as proposed in the *rasa sūtra* viz, *vibhava*, *anubhāva*, *vyabhicāri bhava*, *sthāyī bhava* and for the constructs of *samyoga* and *niṣpatti*.

Methodology

I propose to adopt the following method for this presentation. I shall take each of *alaṅkāra*, *rīti*, *guṇa*, *vakrokti*, *dhvani*, *rasa* and *aucitya*, describe it briefly without technical details and trace its conceptual evolution in *kāvya-mīmāṃsā*. Next, I shall examine the possibility of finding its parallel or analogue in music. If it is available, I arrange its demonstration by Sangita Vidwan R.S.Nanda Kumar. Then this would be followed by an in-depth discussion; the results of which would be recorded. This procedure would be followed in some four sessions. When completed, the whole exercise would be reviewed and if possible, compared with the findings in relation to other arts such as *kāvya*, *nṛtta/nṛtya*, *citra*, *śilpa* and *vāstu*.

I. ALAṅKĀRA

(a) Conceptual Layers

Alaṅkāra is an aesthetic device which attracts enhanced attention by adding beauty or grace to a figure or as a figure in an art. In a corporal sense it does so in two ways: (a) by increasing its potential for beauty by setting off a body part to better appearance or (b) by concealing plainness, inadequacy or blemish. It contributes to aesthesis by understatement, emphasis or overstatement. Its functioning is balance or regulated by another aesthetic device viz. *aucitya* (appropriateness).

Evolution of life has resulted in differentiation, specialisation and sensitisation of the senses of perception. Most important among these are visual and aural which distinguish the

humans from other life forms. This is evident in *alaṅkāra* also which manifests in relation to *rūpa* and *śabda* only both in perception, expression and reception. *Alaṅkāra* as a beautifying device is utilitarian in function as ceramic and plastic designs in graphics and colour in crafted articles while it is non-utilitarian in music and the fine arts. *Alaṅkāra* relates to *rūpa* in painting, sculpture and architecture and to *śabda* in music and poetry. It relates it to both in dance and drama which are at once *dṛśyakāvya* and *śravyakāvya*.

Objects such as wig, robe, sceptre, crown, *yajñopavīta*, weaponry may be ornamented or decorated but are basically insignia of distinction, power or authority and their beautification assumes only an incidental or secondary role.

Alaṅkāra is, naturally, an anthropomorphic concept. Colour patterns, designs, birdsongs in birds, spots, stripes etc in animals and their analogues in plants are evolutionary devices for reproduction and perpetuation. They possess meaning as *alaṅkāra* only by human attribution and extrapolation. Anthropomorphic images of divine, mythical and semi-mythical (e.g. *gandharva*, *apsarasa*, *kimnara*, *kimpurusha*, *nāga*) beings carry *alaṅkāra*s for various parts of the body consistent with such a concept. They are extended to their vehicles (animals or birds) as well as to their weapons. All such ornamental or decorative elements are *alaṅkāra* *per se* and seldom carry a symbolic value. When they do, (e.g. *śaṅkha*, *cakra*, *garuḍa*) they revert to the anthropomorphic image. All such secondary *alaṅkāra*s are intended to converge or redound to the principle image, such, in any case, is the purpose of any *alaṅkāra*, primary or secondary.

(b) *Kāvyaālaṅkāra*

The earliest poetical embellishment in Sanskrit poetry is mentioned by Bharatamuni who describes only four *alaṅkāra*s such as *upamā* with five sub varieties (viz. *praśna*, *nindya*, *kalpita*, *sādrśī* and *kincitsādrśī*) and *yamaka* with its ten varieties. However, it is Bhāmaha who defines it clearly for the first time: it is a figure of speech in which there is obliqueness in both *śabda* and *artha*.

वक्राभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलंकृतिः ।

and proceeds to describe five *alaṅkāra*s, viz. *anuprāsā*, *yamaka*, *upamā*, *rūpaka*, *dīpaka*, *svabhāvokti*, *bhāvikā* and *rasavad*. Agnipurāṇam lists as many as sixteen *alaṅkāra*s. Daṇḍin is more detailed and describes *alaṅkāra* as *dharma* (essential quality, *guṇa*) which lends beauty to *kāvya*.

काव्यशोभाकरान् धर्मान् अलंकारान् प्रचक्षते ।

Thus, these qualities are themselves *alaṅkāra*s; *alaṅkāra* is the beautiful in *kāvya*.

सौन्दर्यमलंकारः, काव्यशोभायां कर्तारो धर्मा गुणाः । तदतिशयहेतवस्त्वलंकाराः ।

The *guṇas* are permanent (*nitya*) *alaṅkāra*; *rūpaka* etc are *gauṇālaṅkāra*s. It is the *guṇas* which determine the *mārga* and *rīti* of *kāvya*. Daṇḍin describes thirtyseven *alaṅkāra*s. Udbhaṭa expands this number to forty one in his Bhamahālaṅkāra. *Alaṅkāra* gained a

conceptual dimension with Rudraṭa who classifies it into sound-embellishment (*śabdālaṅkāra*) and sense-embellishment (*arthālaṅkāra*). Examples of the former are *vakrokti*, *śleṣa*, *citra*, *anuprāsa* and *yamaka*. He classifies *arthālaṅkāra* into four groups viz. *vastu* (23), *upamā* (21), *atiśaya* (12) and *śleṣa* (12) thus totalling 68.

Ānandavardhana comprehends *alaṅkāra* within the *dhvani tattva* and insists that the former justifies its application only when focussing on *rasa* and *bhāva*.

रसभावादि तात्पन्यमाक्षित्य विनिवेशनं ।

अलंकृतिनां सर्वासामलंकारत्वसाधनम् ।

He also suggests ways and means of integrating *alaṅkāra* into *rasa*: 1) keeping *rasa* always in focus 2) disabusing one's mind that *alaṅkāra* is central to poetry. 3) exercising the right to accept or reject *alaṅkāra* if the occasion demands it. 4) not making *alaṅkāra* very elaborate. 5) always subordinating *alaṅkāra* to *rasa*. In fact, he goes even to the extent of saying that *alaṅkāra* is a structural element of poetic experience which springs to the mind spontaneously and effortlessly when the mind is drenched in *rasa*. He classifies *alaṅkāras* in three ways - rooted in *upamā* (or *sādrśya*), in *virodha* and in *sambandha*. Abhinavagupta supports this view emphasising the role of the poet's primary experience (*alaṅkārya*) only because of which an *alaṅkāra* acquires the quality and status of *alaṅkāra*. Bhoja classifies *alaṅkāra* into external, internal and both but loses the seriousness of the discussion by going into extremes in details.

Ruyyaka is the most systematic in classification and discussion of *alaṅkāras*. His insights into *kāvya* are profound and effective. He enunciates five criteria of classification viz. *sādrśya* (similarity), *virodha* (opposition), *śṛṅkhalā nyāya* (chain like), *kāvya nyāya* (poetic analogue) and *gūḍhārtha* (concealed meaning). He is even more detailed in enumerating and illustrating principles of sub-classification such as *bheda*, *abheda*, *āropa*, *adhyavasāya*, *viśeṣya-viśeṣaṇa bhāva* and *pada-vākya-gatatva*. He gives some examples of these; *adhyavasāya-utprekṣā*, *atiśaya* etc; *vyāṅgya-samāsokti*, *aprastutaprasaṃsā*, *paryāyokti* etc; *virodha-virodhābhāsa*, *asaṅgati*, *viśama* etc. *śṛṅkhalā- sāra*, *ekāvalī* etc.

Thus, *alaṅkāra* grew in conceptual density, classificatory criteria and number in course of time from about the 2nd cent AD to about 10th cent. AD. It proliferated in number from Bharatamuni (4) through Agnipurāṇa, Bhāmaha (38), Daṇḍi (37), Udbhaṭa (41), Vāmana (31), Rudraṭa (55), Bhoja (54), Mammaṭa (69), Ruyyaka (81), Viśvanātha (89), Jayadeva (100) to Appayyadīkṣita (115). Among these Ruyyaka has the most insights of the poetic experience in respect of *alaṅkāra* and is followed generally by Viśvanātha, Vidhyādhara, Appayyadīkṣita etc. Proliferation in the beginning indicates a process of stabilisation in the career of any organic or creative manifestation; but, when excessive, of decay. This is true of *alaṅkāra* also. Fortunately, it stemmed the decay by shifting from a central position of *prasthāna* to that of an *aṅga* to *rasa* and was governed by such concepts as *aucitya*. In European aesthetics, the analogue of *alaṅkāra* namely, figure and image became in course of time an undergrowth of wilderness in the forms of Gongerism, Morrinism and Culturism all

of which died a natural death. In any case, it never received a systematic study as it did in Indian aesthetics. Simile, metaphor, synecdoche, metonymy are the more important figures based on relationships; personification and apostrophe, based on meaning while rhyme, alliteration and consonance are based on sound.

It is obvious that music cannot stimulate, simulate, evoke, augment or emphasise the poetic dimensions of *alaṅkāra* because its base symbol viz. *Svara* or its duration does not have the transactions of *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇa* and *vyañjana*. At best, it can and does offer an attractive and emotional media. Vidwan Nanda Kumar will now offer an illustration from *Saundaryalaharī* in support of this contention in respect of *sandehālaṅkāra*. It may be noted in passing that this *alaṅkāra* relates to music in this poem.

गले रेखास्त्रिभुजो गतिगमकगीतैकनिपुणे ।
 विवाहव्यानद्धप्रगुणगुणसंख्याप्रतिभुवः ।
 विराजन्ते नानाविधमधुररागाकरभुवाम् ।
 त्रयाणां ग्रामाणां स्थितिनियमसीमान इव ते ॥

The second illustration is even more intriguing and interesting because it lends itself to the imputation of multiple *alaṅkāras*. Music, because of a total lack of verbal analogues, cannot rise to the task of suggesting, indicating or establishing this or that *alaṅkāra*. This illustration is also from *Saundaryalaharī*.

गतैर्मणिक्वत्वं गगनमणिभिः सान्द्रवदितं ।
 किरीटं ते हैमं हिमगिरिसुते कीर्तयति यः ।
 सनीडेयच्छायाच्छृणुशबलं चन्द्रशकलं ।
 धनुः शैनासीरः किमिति न निबध्नयाति धिषणां ॥

Lakṣmīdhara perceives the possibilities of numerous *alaṅkāras* in the relationship between the digit of the Moon occurring in the crown of *Pārvatī* and the rainbow, such as *utprekṣā*, *atīśayokti*, *sandeha* and *apahṇava* but he himself is inclined to *sandehasāṅkara alaṅkāra*. How can a purely melodic passage ever stimulate such subtle word images?

c) *Alaṅkāra* in Music

While *alaṅkāra* was regarded as inseparable from *kāvya-rasa*, there is an analogue in music which by an interesting coincidence is also called *alaṅkāra* - which is inseparable from *saṅgītarasa* - indeed it is the warp and woof of all melodic kinesis. In Indian music *alaṅkāra* operates in three layers: *svara* (the individual note), *svara samuccaya varṇālaṅkāra* (patterned *svara* phrase), patterned *rāga* segments (*sthāya* or *ṭhāya* melodic figure). Its function is thus progressive and systematic. Its basic purpose is generation of *rakti* (aesthesis) which is the *sine quo non* for all forms of art. This is realised in each form of art by methods, techniques and devices which are appropriate and peculiar to itself. As shown above, the term *alaṅkāra* has two meanings which are relevant to aesthetic experience viz. sustenance/ adequacy and ornament/ decoration/ embellishment. Both are fulfilled by *alaṅkāra* in each of the above three layers.

Svara is the stuff of which all melody is made and is defined in Indian music as that which generates *rañjana* (aesthetic delight) by itself i.e. independent of any and all extraneous factors. It is thus, an autonomous entity. The term is etymologically derived in two ways: 'sva+rāj' (*rāj* = *dīpti* i.e. intensity of aesthesis; or shining i.e. self luminous); *svr* = (musical) sound, warming of the heart with aesthetic delight; *svr* = śabdopatāpayoh). Both derivations make svara the source of *rakti* and therefore of *rasa* in music. However, svara is seldom performed in a static, constant pitch in Indian music, be it southern or northern. It is almost always used in a dynamic, curved or oscillatory state which is pleasing to the listener's mind. The process causing this defined as *gamakas*: the shaking of the note which gives pleasure to the mind of the listener. This may happen in almost infinite ways in nature and nuance, depending on socio-cultural conditioning and specific musical exigencies. Admitting the impossibility of defining and classifying them all, *śāstra* has arranged them into fifteen broad categories each of which hosts a very large number of subvarietieś, some of which are practiced in vocal and instrumental music. It is important to note that *gamaka* is not an adventitious, extraneous process applied to svara, but is integral to it and is its essential attribute as a consequence of which the svara assumes different shades or shapes in different contexts. Thus, *gamaka* is an *alaṅkāra* of *svara* in both the meanings. It is the very warp and woof of the fabric of Indian music. Its frequent translation as embellishment should be taken in this sense.

(Demonstrations of *svara* in *gamaka*)

Secondly, *alaṅkāra* operates as figuration in the form of *varṇālaṅkāra*. The adjectival term *varṇa* is derived from the verbal stem 'varṇ' and is poly semantic. It means among others, cover, figure, shape, colour, lustre, class and extension.

Bharatamuni is the earliest known authority who mentions *varṇālaṅkāra* in the context of music. He explains *varṇa* as derived (only) from *svara*, which draws out (*anukarṣa*) the word text in a play. In this sense, it corresponds to the term 'dhātu' (as opposed to 'mātu' (word), used in medieval and later times. Bharata restricts the term to *gīta* occurring in a play and warns that drawn out *varṇa* is unsuitable to *dhruva* songs. Abhinavagupta clearly explains that *varṇa* is a word which means the process of expansion of the act of melodisation. It seems to have retained this meaning of melodisation of a word text, even after it was weaned later from *nāṭya*. Kallinātha defines it as elaboration of *svara* and *pada*.

Varṇa may therefore be interpreted as the process of beautifying (*alaṅkāra*), *mātu* (word) with *dhātu* (melody) in music or drama. It did not include un-patterned, free flow of melody as in the *ālāpa* in a *rāga*. *Varṇa* was classified into four categories on the basis of the character of the melody and the direction of its flow, namely, static (*sthāyī*), ascending (*ārohi*), descending (*avarohī*) and irregular, mixed (*sañcārī*); an analogous fourfold classification of *varṇa* into *brahmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya* and *śūdra* on the basis of *guṇa* and *karma* may be recalled here.

Any particular instance of *varṇa* is defined as *alanṅkāra*. It signifies a melodic situation in which the *svara* phrase is distinctly patterned. Such pattern is matched or contrasted with the syllabic or prosodial pattern of the word text, thus embellishing the latter, augmenting its meaning and mood. *Alanṅkāra* in this sense, is of the very essence of music, since, most of it is composed to words in India. After describing 63 *varṇālanṅkāras*, Śārngadeva concedes that they are indeed endless and cannot be entirely comprehended in the *śāstra*.

अनन्तत्वात् ते शास्त्रे न सामस्त्येन किरतिताः ।

He extols *varṇālanṅkāra* for its three benefits namely, generation of *rakti*, precise understanding of *svarasthāna* and distinctiveness and beauty of *varṇa* in song.

रक्तिलाभः स्वरज्ञानं वर्णगानां विचित्रता

ईति प्रयोजनान्याहुरलंकारनिरूपणे ॥

(Demonstrations of *varṇālanṅkāra*)

It is interesting that there is another form of *alanṅkāra* (in Karnataka music) called *tālālanṅkāra*. While *varṇālanṅkāra* may be performed in any *rāga*, in any *laya*, and in any *tāla* or without *tāla*, *tālālanṅkāra* is a melodic pattern set within a *tālāvarta* such that the pattern suggests the division of the *alanṅkāra* into the *aṅga* of the *tāla*. This is set to a progressive, repeating pattern so that this *alanṅkāra* is always performed in song set to a *tāla*.

(Demonstrations of *Tālālanṅkāra*)

While *gamaka* is a *svara* embellishment, *sthāya* is an embellishment of melodic figure in a *rāga* (or song). Both *sthāya* and *vāga* (i.e. *gamaka*) are known in the professional parlance of musicians in India since about the 12th cent. AD. *Sthāya* is also phonetically deteriorated into *thāya*. *Thāyas* are classified into four groups: articulate and unmixed (*vyakti-asaṅkīrṇa*) unmixed (*asaṅkīrṇa*), mixed (*saṅkīrṇa*) and combined (*miśra*). Ninety-six *thāyas* are described in *śāstra* though, in theory, they could be infinite. The *sthāya* is not only a limb (*avayava*) of *rāga*, a melodic figure, but is at the same time, a technique of its beautification, and is thus, integral with it. It is the foundation of aesthetic experience of a *rāga*, even as *varṇālanṅkāra* is that of melodic figure and *gamaka* is of *svara*. It is unique to Indian music, an explicit, general and well articulated analysis of the aesthetic content of the melodic element of music. Such techniques include, among others, simulation of instrumental sound, timbre or technique in voice and vice versa, regional peculiarities or characteristics, horizontal, vertical, or curved figuration, gait or pace of melodic progress, substitution or simulation of *aṁśasvara*, intensification, softening, diminuendo, crescendo, efflorescence, terseness, tenderness, gracefulness, evenness, unctuousness, waviness, elongation, concentration, cyclisation etc. in the execution of melodic figure, imitation of Vedic intonation, insertion of a spanning passage preceding the coda, compacting long passages, insertion of motifs common to two or more *rāgas* etc etc.

(Demonstration of *thāyas* and role of *alanṅkāra* in *rāga* structuring)

Svara is the stuff of which all melody is made and is defined in Indian music as that which generates *rañjana* (aesthetic delight) by itself i.e. independent of any and all extraneous factors. It is thus, an autonomous entity. The term is etymologically derived in two ways: 'sva+rāj' (*rāj* = *dīpti* i.e. intensity of aesthesis; or shining i.e. self luminous); *svr* = (musical) sound, warming of the heart with aesthetic delight; *svr* = śabdopatāpayoh). Both derivations make svara the source of *rakti* and therefore of *rasa* in music. However, svara is seldom performed in a static, constant pitch in Indian music, be it southern or northern. It is almost always used in a dynamic, curved or oscillatory state which is pleasing to the listener's mind. The process causing this defined as *gamakas*: the shaking of the note which gives pleasure to the mind of the listener. This may happen in almost infinite ways in nature and nuance, depending on socio-cultural conditioning and specific musical exigencies. Admitting the impossibility of defining and classifying them all, *śāstra* has arranged them into fifteen broad categories each of which hosts a very large number of subvarieties, some of which are practiced in vocal and instrumental music. It is important to note that *gamaka* is not an adventitious, extraneous process applied to svara, but is integral to it and is its essential attribute as a consequence of which the svara assumes different shades or shapes in different contexts. Thus, *gamaka* is an *alaṅkāra* of *svara* in both the meanings. It is the very warp and woof of the fabric of Indian music. Its frequent translation as embellishment should be taken in this sense.

(Demonstrations of *svara* in *gamaka*)

Secondly, *alaṅkāra* operates as figuration in the form of *varṇālaṅkāra*. The adjectival term *varṇa* is derived from the verbal stem 'varṇ' and is poly semantic. It means among others, cover, figure, shape, colour, lustre, class and extension.

Bharatamuni is the earliest known authority who mentions *varṇālaṅkāra* in the context of music. He explains *varṇa* as derived (only) from *svara*, which draws out (*anukarṣa*) the word text in a play. In this sense, it corresponds to the term 'dhātu' (as opposed to 'mātu' (word), used in medieval and later times. Bharata restricts the term to *gīta* occurring in a play and warns that drawn out *varṇa* is unsuitable to *dhruva* songs. Abhinavagupta clearly explains that *varṇa* is a word which means the process of expansion of the act of melodisation. It seems to have retained this meaning of melodisation of a word text, even after it was weaned later from *nāṭya*. Kallinātha defines it as elaboration of *svara* and *padā*.

Varṇa may therefore be interpreted as the process of beautifying (*alaṅkāra*), *mātu* (word) with *dhātu* (melody) in music or drama. It did not include un-patterned, free flow of melody as in the *ālāpa* in a *rāga*. *Varṇa* was classified into four categories on the basis of the character of the melody and the direction of its flow, namely, static (*sthāyī*), ascending (*ārohi*), descending (*avarohī*) and irregular, mixed (*saicārī*); an analogous fourfold classification of *varṇa* into *brahmaṇa*, *kṣatriya*, *vaiśya* and *śūdra* on the basis of *guṇa* and *karma* may be recalled here.

Any particular instance of *varṇa* is defined as *alanṅkāra*. It signifies a melodic situation in which the *svara* phrase is distinctly patterned. Such pattern is matched or contrasted with the syllabic or prosodial pattern of the word text, thus embellishing the latter, augmenting its meaning and mood. *Alanṅkāra* in this sense, is of the very essence of music, since, most of it is composed to words in India. After describing 63 *varṇālanṅkāras*, Śārngadeva concedes that they are indeed endless and cannot be entirely comprehended in the *śāstra*.

अनन्तत्वानु ते शास्त्रे न सामस्त्येन किरिताः ।

He extols *varṇālanṅkāra* for its three benefits namely, generation of *rakti*, precise understanding of *svarasthāna* and distinctiveness and beauty of *varṇa* in song.

रक्तिलाभः स्वरज्ञानं वर्णगानां विचित्रता

इति प्रयोजनान्याहुरलंकारनिरूपणे ॥

(Demonstrations of *varṇālanṅkāra*)

It is interesting that there is another form of *alanṅkāra* (in Karnataka music) called *tālālanṅkāra*. While *varṇālanṅkāra* may be performed in any *rāga*, in any *laya*, and in any *tāla* or without *tāla*, *tālālanṅkāra* is a melodic pattern set within a *tālāvarta* such that the pattern suggests the division of the *alanṅkāra* into the *aṅga* of the *tāla*. This is set to a progressive, repeating pattern so that this *alanṅkāra* is always performed in song set to a *tāla*.

(Demonstrations of *Tālālanṅkāra*)

While *gamaka* is a *svara* embellishment, *sthāya* is an embellishment of melodic figure in a *rāga* (or song). Both *sthāya* and *vāga* (i.e. *gamaka*) are known in the professional parlance of musicians in India since about the 12th cent. AD. *Sthāya* is also phonetically deteriorated into *thāya*. *Thāyas* are classified into four groups: articulate and unmixed (*vyakti-asāṅkīrṇa*) unmixed (*asāṅkīrṇa*), mixed (*saṅkīrṇa*) and combined (*miśra*). Ninety-six *thāyas* are described in *śāstra* though, in theory, they could be infinite. The *sthāya* is not only a limb (*avayava*) of *rāga*, a melodic figure, but is at the same time, a technique of its beautification, and is thus, integral with it. It is the foundation of aesthetic experience of a *rāga*, even as *varṇālanṅkāra* is that of melodic figure and *gamaka* is of *svara*. It is unique to Indian music, an explicit, general and well articulated analysis of the aesthetic content of the melodic element of music. Such techniques include, among others, simulation of instrumental sound, timbre or technique in voice and vice versa, regional peculiarities or characteristics, horizontal, vertical, or curved figuration, gait or pace of melodic progress, substitution or simulation of *aṁśasvara*, intensification, softening, diminuendo, crescendo, efflorescence, terseness, tenderness, gracefulness, evenness, unctuousness, waviness, elongation, concentration, cyclisation etc. in the execution of melodic figure, imitation of Vedic intonation, insertion of a spanning passage preceding the coda, compacting long passages, insertion of motifs common to two or more *rāgas* etc etc.

(Demonstration of *thāyas* and role of *alanṅkāra* in *rāga* structuring)

II. Rīti, Mārga - Shaili

1. Poetic Style

After *alaṃkāra*, let me turn to the second literary aesthetic model viz. *rīti* and examine whether it could be extended as a musico-aesthetic model. The term was first introduced by Vāmana as the very soul of poetry : *rītīrātmā kāvyasya*. Earlier, Daṇḍin had used '*mārga*' synonymously to stress the importance of the way or manner in which words are composed to communicate effectively the intended meaning and mood in poetry.

The notion of *rīti* arose in recognition of the need to match the medium with expression and emerged as rhetoric in the context of oratory. Bharatamuni had already provided a base for the notion of *rīti* in the form of *alaṃkāras*, many of which later came to be regarded as *guṇa* (merit) of poetry. Indeed, Bhāmaha had previously recognised *vaidarbhī* and *gaudī* as distinct manners of word composition in poetic endeavour, and had called them varieties (*kāvyajāti*) instead of as distinctive modes of poetic expression.

Imagery is inextricably integral to any distinctive poetic expression. It is also a fundamental process of the human mind and refers to the mental reproduction of sensory and perceptive experience. It is not restricted to only the visual and may be gustatory and olfactory also. It varies from one individual to another depending on his mental action and reaction to signs and symbols presented by the external world. Such a capacity - unique to the human psyche - is possible because of symbolic transformation of experiences, as a result of which language is born according to Symbolistic Philosophers. Image may be defined as that which presents an intellectual and emotional complex in the mind in an instant of time. It is not merely a visual, aural or structural expression but is, for the poet, the totality of a complex experience which is compounded of thought and feeling. Imagery emerges from the totality of human experience of the past and present ('stream of consciousness') and is rooted in myth, ritual, sacrament and so on. It becomes an instrument at the hands of the poet in expressing the new and original in terms of the old by association and similitude..It is born when creative urge transcends his familiar thoughts and familiar strata of experience leaving him with realization that the day-to-day ordinary expressions of language are too poor and too inadequate. Because he is fettered to his medium, he engages in an adventure to generate the unfamiliar from the familiar. The result is imagery.

Vāmana defines *rīti* as *viśiṣṭapadaracanā* i.e. composing words in a manner which is characteristic, special, individualistic, peculiar or unique to the particular poet. He analyses this into ten elements called *guṇa* (merit) : *śleṣa* (closely knit), *prasāda* (readily intelligible in meaning, lucidly understood), *samatā* (evenness in soft or gentle structuring : *mṛdubandha*, clear structuring: *sphuṭabandha*, and mixed structuring: *miśrabandha* of words), *mādhurya* (composing words in which *rasa* is readily manifested in both sound and meaning), *sukumāratā* (absence of harsh words, striking a balance between loose and light structuring of words), *arthavyakti* (unequivocity in meaning), *udāratā* (words which highlight or emphasize the excellence of a particular merit), *ojas* (copious compounding of words - specially true of prose), *kānti* (-*sarvajagatkāntam* i.e. pleasing to everyone) and *samādhī* (attributing the nature of something to something else). Among these, *śleṣa*, *samata*, *ojas* and *sukumāratā* are classified as merits of *śabda* (sound) while *prasāda*, *arthavyakti*, *kānti* etc. are merits of *artha* (meaning). *Śabdaguṇas* are realised in terms of euphony or musicality (*kevalam śrutipeśalam*) and *arthaguṇa* in words.

In defining *rīti* as *viśiṣṭapadaracanā*, Vāmana explains *viśiṣṭa* (characteristic, peculiar, unique, special, individualistic, original) as words imbibing the *guṇas*; thus *rīti* and *guṇa* are inseparable. *Doṣa* (demerit) is defined as opposite of *guṇa*; Vāmana classifies them in two ways; gross and subtle, as well as demerit of word, word meaning, sentence and sentence-meaning. Good poetry should eschew demerits and imbibe merits. Because of their indispensability, he designates *guṇas* as constant embellishment (*nityālaṃkāras*) and extends the notion to both sound and meaning. He defines the selfsame *guṇas* differently for *śabda* and for *artha*, straining plausibility to some extent, though appealing to aesthete's sympathy as a methodological necessity. While Bhāmaha describes two '*kāvya-jātis*' viz. *vaidarbhī* and *gaudī*, Vāmana adds a third viz. *pāñcālī*. Rudraṭa adds two more : *lātīya* and *avantikā*, Vāmana defines *vaidarbhī* as possessed of all ten *guṇas* and the others as consisting of only a few *guṇas* ; he postulates *rīti* as an independent aesthetic model in literary criticism. Rudraṭa, on the other hand, integrates it with the *rasa* model. Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta seem to use the term *saṃghaṭaka* as a structural synonym of *rīti*.

Kuntaka liberates *rīti* from provincial nomenclature; he relates it to the poet's mental dispositions and names poetic styles as *sukumāramārga*, *vicitramārga* and *madhyamārga*. He holds that each of these is laudable if illuminated by the poet's resources, experience and intuitive genius. He defines four *guṇas* viz. *mādhurya*, *prasāda*, *lāvaṇya* and *ābhijātya* and adapts each to each *mārga*.

Rīti is translated as style in this study. Some of its characteristics may be briefly noted here : clarity of expression and purity of language are its *sine qua non*; elevatedness and ornateness are its desiderata. Its expression should be out of the ordinary and be distinctive; it should involve unusual usages. It should eschew artificiality; it should be governed by good taste and spontaneity. It should maintain a balance between, and control over language, content ornamentation. Embellishment should be guided by necessity and appropriateness. High, ornate style may turn into bombast and simplicity into boredom by the poet's weaknesses. Individual style must be developed through experience, effort and discernment. Such style should walk between bombast and artificiality on the one hand and oversimplicity and colloquy on the other; It should develop beauty and natural dignity. Recent history of thought on style shows that style is more and more an internalised phenomenon than it is definable in terms of its external characteristics. This is suggested by consideration of the following successive questions: Is style a garment of feeling? Is it its skin? Is it its embellishment? Is it its facial lustre or complexion? Is it an incarnation of the poet's thought and feelings? ..

Whatever the answers to these questions, it is certain that style is the stamp of the personality of the poet. It is generally classified into three kinds; great, grand and simple or into four kinds *udātta* (magnificent), *sālaṃkṛta* (*vicitra-mārga*), *sarala* (*sukumāra*).

2. Musical Style

It is possible to draw a few parallels between literary style and musical style. For example, most of the immediately foregoing observations on style may be extended to music also and musical style may be defined as *viśiṣṭasvararacanā*, if patterned *svara* durations may be defined as *laya* so that the latter may be included in the definition. But musical style can be hardly described as the soul of music because, while poetry is uniquely based on word, music has, in its autonomy, plural bases. It is interesting that even before style was mooted in literary criticism by Vāmana, Mātāṅgamuni had effectively applied the notion of style in the performance of ancient song varieties called *śuddha*, *bhinna*, *gauḍa*, *vesara* and *sādhārīta*, from which the respective *rāga* types were abstracted. The literary styles of songs were also typified in to four kinds called *māgadhi*, *ardhamāgadhi*, *pṛthulā* and *saṃbhāvitā* based on their syllabic densities and dynamics. Certain religious forms of ancient Indian music such as *brahmagīti*, *prakaraṇagīti*, *kapālagīti* and *kambalagīti* probably involved stylised performance. It may be noted that these were musical forms loaded with word structures.

However, a fundamental difference between the symbolic materials of literature-and music is that the *svara* has, unlike the *pada*, no connotative or denotative functions and has no lexical dimensions (such as dictionary-or idiomatic meanings). Because such symbolic materials viz. tone and rhythm are transparent and because they bring about universalisation (*sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*) unburdened with word-meaning associations, the selfsame physical, objective frame of performed pure music can mean different things to different listeners. Its symbols are multivalent and therefore readily lend themselves to distinct subjective association and interpretation. This is true of both music and the listener. Therefore style, collective or individual, is an important contributory factor in aesthetic experience.

Style may be described in many ways. It is a mode of expressing something and is common to all sentient beings. In art, it is a successful endeavour of fusing content with form. Its nature is complex and obscure but it is readily recognized. It is of two tendencies viz. classical and romantic. Classical style is not object oriented, but is subject oriented and has a lofty expressional medium. In romantic style imaginativeness is more prominent than objectivity. Style is the stamp of individual peculiarity which enables classification of composers into excellent, moderate and poor. I have detailed elsewhere the merits and faults of music composers. Style is the characteristic manner of presentation of a musical work and is the totality of the devices and procedures, peculiarities and proclivities of the composer and (especially in Indian music) of the performer, in the matter of melody, rhythm, colour, form and texture. Style also means the characteristic or peculiar mode of collective presentation of a music of a definite, historical era or epoch, representing the thinking, feeling, attitude, goals and ideals of the period in its total reaction to the aesthetic, ethical, religious, philosophical, social and cultural environment. It embraces all the factors which have a bearing on the grammar, syntax, idiom and rhetoric. Style is an hierarchical expression in the sense of individual variation, functioning in an interconnected, interdependent web of collective expression in the context of experience of beauty.

Music style is a more or less complex system of sound-rhythm relationships understood and performed by a music community under the following psychostylic conditions:

- i. Only some sounds or sound-combinations are possible in a system (e.g. musical systems of the West, India, China, Malaysia, Egypt, Islamic countries).
- ii. Such sounds may have multiple contextual values within defined limits as in a *rāga*.

- iii. Combinations of phrases of such sounds may be made only in certain ways (e.g. *sāmānyā*, *viśeṣa* and *apūrva sañcāras in vakra and bhāṣāṅga rāgas*).
- iv. The above three conditions involve probabilistic relationships which prevail within the given musical system as well as several laws pertaining to melodic kinesis such as Law of Return, Law of Expectancy, Law of Prager and so on.
- v. Such relationships are functions of the context within a musical form in particular as well as within the style system in general.

Musical style is the corpus of expressive material, method and technique in which musical meanings are generated. Musical style differs from one culture to another, from one epoch to another within the same culture, and within an epoch and culture. It varies within the same epoch from composer to composer, from school to school and from performer to performer. Such large variation in styles is the result of psychological changes in habits of both composers, performers and listeners in perception, disposition, susceptibility and response. Underlying such multiplicity is the constant or common psychological processes such as the modalities of the mind in selecting and organizing stimuli which are available to it within culturally settled norms and standards. Styles emerge when a gap occurs in traditional continuity, when there is redundancy in creating or performance and when socio-historical, socio-cultural, socio-religious etc. environment of music change in direction and intensity.

All music activity is directed to only three sources viz. composer, performer and listener. When musical style has settled among these as habituated response it becomes an intricate probability system. This is readily seen from the fact that musical activities of *rāga*, *tāla* and musical form (*prabandha*) are probability functions of tone and rhythm in terms of variation, recurrence, return, tension, resolution, expectancy etc. Continuity in tradition occurs when probabilities of these are high and modernisms, when low. Style is stable when a corpus of probabilities continues to be high; it is decaying when they tend to be low.

The term 'style' has many connotational ramifications in Indian music and is applied in numerous contexts and layers. Thus it is applied to a system (e.g. Karnataka-Hindusthani, Folk, Film, Light Classical, Religious, Jazz), compositional form (e.g. *Dhrupad gāyakī*, *Thumri gāyakī*, *Tappa gāyakī*, *Khyāl gāyakī*, *Varṇa*, *Pada*, *Jāvali*, *Pallavi*), subdivisions of a single musical form (e.g. *Dhrupad: Gaurhāri, Nauhāri, Dāgarī, Khaṇḍārī*; *Thumri: Pūrab, Pañjābi, Dilli, Pahāḍī*); medium resources (e.g. vocal, violin, *viṇā*, *nāgasvara*, flute, *sarod*, *sitār*, *tabla*, *pakhāvaj*, *dilrūbā*, *bānsuri*), evolutionary state (romantic, renaissance, baroque, modern in Western music), performer and composer (e.g. Musical Trinity, Svāti Tirunaḷ, Mysore Sadāśiva Rāo, Ūttukkāḍu Venkaṭasubbayya,

Vīṇā Seṣaṇṇa, Mysore Vāsudevāchārya, Vīṇā Kuppayyar, Ponnayya Piḷḷai, Paṭṇam Subrahmaṇya Ayyar). Performers (Ariyākkuḍi Rāmānuja Ayyaṅgār, Ālattūru Brothers, Mahārājapuram Viśvanātha Ayyar, Kāraikkuḍi Sāmbaśiva Ayyar, Vīṇā Dhanammāl, Bālamuralikṛṣṇa, Pālaghāṭ Maṇi Ayyar, Mysore T. Chowḍayya, Flute Mahāliṅgam, Vīṇā Bālacander etc.); *guruparamparā* (e.g. *gharānās* in Hindusthani music and *bāni* in Karnataka music); regional characteristics or flavour (*Vīṇā* - Mysore, Tanjore, Vizianagaram, Travancore, *tabla* (Delhi, Banares, Jaipur, Lucknow)).

Certain principles engendered in style may be briefly mentioned. At the outset, style reveals the manner in which *nāda* (*śruti*, *svara*, *anusvara*) and *laya* (*gati*, *jati*, *jāti*, *kāla* and *kalā*) elements operate in the composition. The central objective of style is to communicate musical meaning in a special, attractive way. Meaning is born when an individual is aware affectively and / or intellectually of the implications of a stimulus in a particular context. When this becomes habitual or unthinking, the stimulus generates neither meaning nor meaninglessness. The experience is neutral. In music, if a tone series or rhythm moves in an expected and probable way without deviation, it is the neutral way. But if the experient's expectant habit responses are delayed or blocked, that is, if the course of stylistic mental events is disturbed and is deviated in some way, then musical meaning is born. This is analogous to the physical law of inertia: a body continues to be at rest or to move with uniform velocity unless it is disturbed by an external influence. The basic requirements of communication through style are clarity, purity, effectiveness, beautiful form, as well as a kind of loftiness, unusualness, embellishment and novelty.

Style may be classified into grand, ornate, middle, plain, forceful, sublime, tender and so on. A single composition can hardly be characterised by only one of these terms. A composer may be usually characterised by a single attribute or by a combination of a few of these in the totality of his creative endeavour. Style should be appropriate to the content and form of the composition. It should eschew excessiveness of any kind. It should be regarded as neither the medium nor the garb of content. It is integral with, and inseparable from content. A composer creates his own style out of the totality of his personality which has many facets. Emotive, creative, imaginative, contemplative, beauty-sensitiveness, virtuosity in materials and method, skill in organization are some of the qualities which conduce most to music composing and performing. Composer's personality is influenced by several factors such as

- a) Nature, possibilities and limitations of the music system.
- b) Interaction between the composer's individual consciousness and the society's collective consciousness. It is this that establishes a triangular relationship between composer, performer and listener.

- c) Cultural, spiritual and social environment surrounding the composer.
- d) *Guru-śiṣya paramparā* and *sampradāya*.
- e) Sources and authority of *śāstra* available to the composer / performer.
- f) Objectives of music and life as envisioned by composer / performer and their attitudes to and goals of life.

Style of music composer / performer may become distinctive for three reasons; individual idiosyncrasy, special, characterising techniques of expression and originality in creative endeavour. Creativity may be primary by breaking new ground such as altering the spirit and structure of the system itself by creating fundamentals such as *varṇa*, *rāga*, *tāla*, *prabandha*, *vādyā*, *tānam*, *kalpanāsvara*, *neraval*. It may be secondary by creating a *varṇa*, a *rāga*, a *tāla*, a *prabandha*, a *vādyā*. It may be tertiary by innovating details within a given structure. Endeavour by composer or performer is based on imaginative contemplation and spiritual outlook; but this does not mean withdrawal from reality. Spiritual and / or musical goals should be sought to be achieved in the context of *dharma*, *artha* and *kāma puruṣārthas*.

Compositions of every composer include inferior, middling and great instances. His style should be sought in his best creations. His style grows and matures along with his experience, learning, intensification and deepening of feeling, concepts and creative imagination. These find expression and maturity in his highest songs. In his other songs, uninspired compositional skills are revealed according to the degree of maturity of his style. Thus a study of his style evolution includes an analytical examination of all his available compositions.

Style in classical art forms such as Hindusthani music or Karnataka music operates within constraints, canons and limits of inherited forms, grammar and idiom. The composer works with music materials viz. *rāga*, *tāla* and word and their details as mentioned above. He organizes the materials into a fixed form. The form may be composed in *tāla* (*nibaddha*) or not (*anibaddha*), prescribed (*niryukta*) or not (*aniryukta*) in respect of *rāga*, *tāla*, metre, language and literary emotional theme. He employs appropriate vocal or instrumental devices for formal organization. Then he structures expression into various layers such as compositional form through segmentation, recurrence, development, variation etc. into *rāga* through *daśaprāṇa* and sonance and into *tāla* through its ten vital elements.

Studies in style characterization and style analysis are in infancy in contemporary Indian musicology. Their importance and need can hardly be overemphasized.

III.1. Dhvani

The literary model of poetic experience, called *Dhvani* proposed by Ānandavardhana in the latter half of the ninth cent. A.D. in Kashmir is, in a sense, the first systematic and comprehensive attempt in Sanskrit poetics and has successfully withstood the test of time as well as many critical attacks. It is now universally hailed as theoretically the soundest and practically the most adequate model of literary criticism.

Ānandavardhana draws inspiration from the mature and comprehensive discussion of the functions of the word in language viz. the denotative or lexical meaning (*abhidhā*, *mukhyārtha*, *vācyārthā*, primary sense) by the *Mīmāṃsakas*, the secondary or metaphorical meaning (*lakṣaṇā*) by the *Naiyāyikas*, as well as the indivisibility and unitary nature of meaning of syntactically structured words in a sentence, *śphoṭa* by the Grammarians led by Bhartṛhari. He developed a comprehensive linguistic theory of meaning which not only included these but accommodated within it emotive and other associative meanings also. Logical or lexical interpretation of sentence - meaning fails to take into account contextual factors; indeed, the meaning of whole utterance may be different, even opposite of, what the words themselves mean. The *śphoṭa* theory had accommodated such meanings also by postulating *vaikṛtadhvani*. Such meanings are common enough in the use of ordinary, day-to-day language. Concerning himself with poetic meaning, instead of the entirety of speech activity, he accepted both *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇā* and postulated a third potentiality of language called *vyañjanā* which is the capacity to suggest a meaning other than its literal meaning. He extended the notion of *dhvani* in *śphoṭa* theory and incorporated it into his theory. *Dhvani* is also referred to as *lakṣyārtha*, *lakṣaṇārtha*, *vyangyārtha*, *lakṣaṇāvṛtti*, *guṇāvṛtti*, *bhakti* etc. *Dhvani* may manifest through *alaṃkāra* and *guṇa* or independently by itself directly through *abhidhā* or *lakṣaṇā*. This becomes possible because like *svara* in music, a word also has no fixed and definite meaning but assumes a slightly different meaning in each context or environment in poetry. Such a variable meaning is called sociocultural meaning in modern parlance of literary criticism. This is seen from the fact that a linguistic community develops recurring responses to unique whole utterances or sequences of utterances besides regularly recurring responses to lexical items and syntactical and other structural arrangements. Such former meanings are comprehended by *vyañjanā*. Thus the *dhvani* theory becomes more meaningful in a larger linguistic perspective of understanding fullness of expression (than the merely conventional or lexical and the metaphorical) and of extending the range of meanings to the domain of the inexpressible i.e. totality of human experience. In order to achieve this, language would have to embrace all the contextual factors of linguistic utterances such as intonation, stress,

gestures and even pure sounds as indicators of the full meaning of such utterances including emotion. Such a model would comprehend not only the expressive symbols (*vācaka*) but the indicative signs (*bodhaka*) also as part of language. Thus, for example, the voice of the speaker would define the context more precisely such as sex, age, emotion and perhaps even the identity of the speaker. Ānandavardhana limits his theory to the aesthetic value. Even though *vyañjanā* includes in its broadest sense all such elements, Ānandavardhana restricts *vyañjanā* to poetic experience. He establishes *dhvani* as the soul of poetry and that poetic word may carry beauty literally (*vācya*) or implicitly (*pratīyamāna*). The latter is something more than the former and depends on the whole poem. It is revealed only to the susceptible connoisseur but not to those who are merely experts in *kośa* and *vyākaraṇa*. It functions in terms of an idea, a figure of speech or an emotion. In fact, a scale of grading poetry may be developed in terms of the degree of *dhvani* contained in it. If the suggested meaning is subordinated to the expressed meaning (e.g. as in *samāsokti* or *paryāyokti*) it is called *guṇībhūtavyaṅgya*.

It is important not to lose sight of the fact that the *dhvani model* is not an independent one but is integrated to the theory of *rasa*. *Rasa* was postulated by Bharatamuni as an aesthetic theory to explain the aesthetic experience of the theatre art. Though many aestheticians of the past had realised the validity of the value of *rasa* in poetry, they perceived it as a minor element of the experience which was subordinated to *alaṅkāra*, *guṇa* etc., and none of them had studied it seriously or systematically. Ānandavardhana was the first to show that *dhvani* and *rasa* are mutually inclusive and mutually complementary. *Dhvani* theory emphasizes the method of treatment and the *Rasa* theory, the ultimate effect. *Dhvani* alone is not enough in *nāṭya* or *kāvya*; it must generate *ramaṇīyatā* or *cārutva* which, in turn, is generated by *rasa* alone. *Rasa* itself cannot be directly expressed by words; it can only be suggested. This is upheld by Abhinavagupta who holds that *sthāyibhāvas* and the transitory *vyabhicāribhāvas*, lying dormant in the mind of the spectator are stimulated and roused by *vibhāvas* etc., and are transformed into *rasa*. *Rasa* is suggested by *vyañjanāśakti* of the words (which is postulated by Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka as *bhojakatva vyāpāra* of words). *Rasa* experience is not *anīrvacanīya*. According to Abhinavagupta realization of *rasa* in the connoisseur proceeds in three phases viz. cognition of the formal or intellectual elements of the word content of the poem, idealization of such content through imagination and climaxing of the inexpressible affective content (aesthetic emotion). These three elements (intellection, idealization and emotional climaxing) then blend into a single, focussed sentiment, appeals at the same time to the connoisseur and awakens the same *rasa*. This is experienced as an indivisible whole, leaving no trace of the concomitant components, even as burning camphor leaves no traces. So *rasa dhvani* is designated

asamlakṣyakrama-vyāṅgya. This factor, relating to stylistic structure consisting of words, parts of words, sentence, whole poem or individual sounds, is named *saṃghaṭanā* by Ānandavardhana and Abhinavagupta.

Discussion of criticisms against *dhvani* and classification of *dhvani* are outside the scope of the present paper.

Dhvani theory addresses itself for the first time in the history of Indian poetics to the following and related questions :

1. Which are the inessential and essential parts of *alaṃkāra*, *guṇa*, *rīti*, *vṛtti* and *saṃghaṭanā* in poetic experience?
2. Why were the inessential parts confounded for the essential?
3. Who is competent to experience the core of the aesthetic process?
4. How are the poet's creativity and the connoisseur's susceptibility matched?
5. How is excellence in great poetry recognized?
6. How can poetic excellence be graded?
7. What are the criteria for aesthetic emotion?
8. What means are available to the connoisseur to recognize poetic excellence?

2. Dhvani in Music

The word *dhvani* is polysemantic in Sanskrit. But its most popular senses are voice and inarticulate sound. It is used in the sense of voice in the Vedic literature including *Upaniṣat*, *Prātiśākhya*s and *Śikṣā*s. It is of two kinds : natural and artificial. Sounds of thunder, sea, wind, rain etc. are natural sounds. Laughter, crying, loud weeping and ejaculation are man made sounds but are inarticulate. Articulated and organised sounds are artificial and constitute language. Inarticulate sounds of musical instruments such as those of the voice, chordophones, aerophones, membranophones and idiophones are all uniformly called *dhvani* in musical parlance. Animal sounds and bird cries are inarticulate and are also called *dhvani*.

In *saṃgītasāstra* Maṭaṅgamuni offers a philosophical discussion of *dhvani* extolling it as the ultimate cause of everything that moves and moves not. It is all pervasive and gives pleasure to every living being in different countries (*deśa*) according to its desire and is hence called *deśī*. This is possible because, even though it has no definite form, it can be experienced directionally in space and moves within and without the living body according to its position therein. From *dhvani* is born *bindu*, from *bindu* is born *nāda*. From *nāda* are born *mātrkā*s. These are of two kinds viz. vowel and consonant. Their

entirety is said to be the light of the world. Among them, the vowels cause all consonants to be manifested. Hence they are called *svaras*. Śadja etc. are also called *svaras* (or *śakti*). Consonant is *śiva* and combines with *śakti*. Together they describe the world in the form of sound and meaning. They are therefore called *varṇas*. Word is formed from *varṇas* (syllable); a sentence is formed from verb and inflected words. The Great sentence (of the *Upaniṣats*) arises from sentence. Similarly are also formed all the Vedas and their ancillary disciplines. Then again arose (*gāndharvaveda*) from the *svaras* (musical notes). Therefore *dhvani* should be understood as the primary generating cause of everything. The entire world is therefore subordinated to it. *Dhvani* is of two kinds viz. manifest and unmanifest. Hence the entirety of *svara* (i.e. *gāndharvaveda*, music) is *dhvani*, which is also called *deśi*. *Dhvani* is also held to be the unit of subdivision of *svara* viz. *śruti* and is classified on the basis of the three fundamental body constituents i.e. *vāta*, *pitta*, *kapha* and their mixture viz. *sannipāta*.

Synonymising *dhvani* with *śabda*, *saṅgītaśāstra* has classified the human singing voice into some thirtyfive types by analysing its quality into basic psychoacoustic elements such as brightness, hollowness, denseness, unctuousness, dryness etc. It has also offered a scheme of classification of limbs of *rāga* (*sthāya/ṭhāya*) relative to the quality of the singing voice.

3. Dhvani and Rāga

Maṭaṅgamuni proposes two definitions of *rāga* in both of which *dhvani* has a keyrole in elucidating the concept of *rāga* :

- a) *yo 'sau dhvaniviśeṣas-tu svaravarṇavibhūṣitaḥ |
rañjako janacittānām sa rāgaḥ kathito budhaiḥ ||*
- b) *svaravarṇaviśiṣṭena dhvanibhedena vā punaḥ |
rajyate yena saccittam sa rāgaḥ sammatām satām ||*

The verbal stem '*rañj*', from which *rāga* is derived, means 'to be dyed, coloured, affected, moved, excited, glad, charmed, delighted, attracted, enamoured, to rejoice, exult and shine bright. A greek cognate of the root is '*rezo*', '*rezeus*'. *Rāga* means the act of colouring, colour, hue, any feeling or passion, interest or joy, delight, beauty (of voice or singing).

Rāga is appealing (*rañjaka*) to *jana* (common men) also, not only to the elite. It is a special or particular kind of sound (*dhvaniviśeṣa*) i.e. sound other than the one used for transactional communication, a sound which is not normally found organised in the referential world; it is abstracted from phenomenal sound, adapted, idealized or refined into a musical symbol. Thus the singing voice is different from speaking voice or voice

used for communication or for nonaesthetic expression; sounds of musical instruments are different from sounds of nature which they often imitate.

Dhvani means suggestiveness in poetry as described above. It is *sui generis*. Its function in language is primarily poetic. It illumines latent or implied meaning lying behind or beyond lexical or conventional meaning of words. It is the total experience of poetry, not an ingredient or component. It establishes aesthetic rapport between poet and connoisseur.

Similarly, *dhvani* is expressiveness rather than expression in *rāga*. It suggests meanings which are autonomous or peculiar to music only and which transcend meanings that accrue from mere sequential or ordered sound patterns. That is, because of *dhvani*, *rāga* begins where melodic structure and melodic kinesis end. The specific aesthetic experience which characterises a *rāga* is generated by *dhvani* and is *sui generis*. *Dhvani* is the exclusive poetic function of nonliteral sound sequence or pattern such as *rāga*. It is the total experience of *rāga*, not its ingredient or component. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts.

Definition (b) elucidates an interaction between musician and listener; *rāga* is that which colours the mind of *sahṛdaya* (connoisseur) in two ways; special (*viśeṣa*) melodic (*svara*) movement (*varṇa*) and different *dhvani*. In this passage 'vā' should be construed in conjunctive or cumulative sense (*samuccayārtha*) rather than optional (*vikalpa*) sense. The first of these ways implies that a particular aesthetic experience is uniquely defined for a given *rāga* by melodic movements which are special to it (*viśeṣa sañcāra* of *rāga*) and not by any or every sequence of musical notes. Such speciality - or specificity of melodic kinesis is physically analysable into, and defined by, the ten vital elements *graha*, *aṁśa*, *nyāsa* etc. The second way of generating *rāgatva* (quality of being *rāga*) is by *dhvanibheda* - a term which is synonymous with *dhvaniviśeṣa* - which is central to the definition (a); 'vā' in the conjunctive or additive sense suggests that *dhvaniviśeṣa* and *viśeṣasvaravarṇa* are mutually complementary. The former provides the general criterion for *rāgatva* while the latter confers the individuating or differentiating criterion. *Dhvanibheda* may also be interpreted as special inflexion (*kāku*) of the medium of expression. This again parallels the poetic method.

The expression '*svavarṇaviśeṣa*' merits further examination. It contains an apparent redundancy because *varṇa*, the act of singing musical phrases includes *svara*. But this expression is not tautological; for '*svara*' here indicates primary aesthetic appeal which it affords in its own autonomy (*svato rañjayati*). This quality of experience includes such attributes of *svara* as contribute to its *rañjakatva* viz. *snigdhatā*, *anuraṇana*, *śrutyantarabhāvitā*, *dūrasrāvyatā* and *gamaka*; these constitute its psychoacoustic aspect.

Next, *varṇa* signifies melodic kinesis i.e. the continuous locus of a moving musical sound. It is this single, continuous musical sound which assumes the character, role and function or expressional / structural vital elements such as *graha*, *aṃśa* and *nyāsa* which elucidate both the generality and specificity of a *rāga*. This is why both *svara* and *varṇa* are separately mentioned and are included in the definition. Both have the power of beautification (*alaṃkāra*). Beauty is the *sine qua non* of all art. When *svara* is ornamented in a manner which is appropriate to the *rāga* and manifests a particular movement pattern, it becomes *alaṃkāra*. *Varṇa* is general and *alaṃkāra* is particular.

The term *dhvani* is employed by both grammarians and poetics to connote, among other things, articulate sound, suggestible meaning or suggestible element in meaning. Abhinavagupta illuminates several dimensions of *dhvani* in his *Dhvanyālokalocana* such as *varṇasphoṭa*, *padasphoṭa*, *vākyasphoṭa*, *prākṛtadhvani*, *vaikṛtadhvani* as well as classification of *dhvani* into *vastu*, *alaṃkāra*, *bhāva* and *rasa*. His considerations may be extrapolated, with appropriate modifications, from the spoken articulate sound to the musical articulate sound. Expression of meaning of nonliteral articulate sound through *dhvani* may be regarded as *rāga*. Use of such sounds in varying durations such as *druta* (fast), and *vilamba* (slow) is of fundamental importance in *rāga*, because other things being equal, it is this structural variability which makes possible a great multiplicity of possible expressions, each of them conferring specificity or individuality on meaning. The concepts of *sphoṭa* and *dhvani* may be readily extended to *rāga* because, though temporal sequentiality of the semantic symbols in both (of phonemes in words, of words in phrases, of phrases in sentence, of sentences in paragraphs or other divisions etc., in language; of *svaras* in *varṇālaṃkāra*, of *varṇālaṃkāras* in *sthāya*, of *sthāyas* in *ākṣiptikā* etc. limbs in *rāga*) are inevitable in all discursive semantic modes, the meaning of the whole is perceived in a burst or flash (*sphoṭa*) only at the end of the final syllable *svara* or *svara*. This results from the progressive accumulation of semantic impresses (*saṃskāra*) of the individual units of elements of expression. *Dhvani* conveys the whole sense (*rāgabhāva*) in a burst at nodal points (*viśeṣa sañcāra*, *apūrva sañcāra*), but not at the end of the final *svara*. In *rāga*, it is possible to suggest its character or nature in the very opening phrase or phrases. It is possible to elucidate its form in successive phases also. However, the musical meaning of a part or whole of any *rāga* expression is manifested in a flash only at the end of the respective final *svara*. It is true that like words in poetry, *svara* and *laya* have contextual and variable meanings. *Kāku* plays an important part in importing *dhvani* meanings, and *apūrva sañcāras* (exceptional phrases) may function as *dhvani* in *rāga*; there are no parallels for *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *tātparya* in *svara* or *svara phrases*. As a consequence, the role of *dhvani* in the experience of *rasa* in music becomes very much weakened. Thus the analogy of *dhvani* may be carried only up to a point in aesthetic experience of music.

IV.1 Vakrokti

Vakrokti is indirect or oblique expression. This is known as a generic name in literary criticism from very early times; it was not regarded as a separate figure of speech by Bhāmaha. According to Daṇḍin, all figures except *svabhāvokti* are *vakrokti*. Ruyyaka regards it as a common name for all *alaṃkāras*. Rudraṭa holds that it is a *śabdālaṃkāra* which generates a secret meaning. It is Kuntaka who elaborates *vakrokti* as a fullfledged literary criterion in his *Vakroktijīvitā*. He conferred a logical climax to the discussion on *alaṃkāra* through it. He describes it as a 'striking expression' which generates a peculiarity in beauty for the purpose of creating such peculiarity so that an unworldly, *camatkāra* (flash of beauty) is created. He defines *vakrokti* as '*vaidagdhyabhaṅgibhaṇiti*'. Its peculiarity eludes common daily usages of language as well as expressions found in the *śāstras*. *Vakrokti* is called *kavi-vyapāra*, *vakratā*, poet's function, or occupation of oblique expression. His expression, born of his intuitive genius, manifests transcendental beauty. Kuntaka's theory encompasses both *alaṃkāra* and *rīti*.

Kuntaka's *vakrokti* is only a different word for Anandavardhana's '*rasābhiniveśana*' or '*rasākṣiptatā*', he further holds that *dhvani* may be a sufficient condition but not a necessary condition for *rasa*. For, *rasa* may emerge even in the absence of *dhvani*. Indeed, *abhidhā* may itself serve as *alaṃkāra* and may serve as a cause for *rasa*. It is then called *abhidhāprakāra viśeṣa* which is created by poetic genius. Then it is both integral with and external to *vastu*.

Kuntaka classifies *vakratā* into five groups :

- a) *varṇavakratā* (similar to *varṇadhvani*) e.g. *anuprāsa*, *yamaka*, *cakravāla* etc.
- b) *padavakratā* (similar to *padadhvani*) e.g. *paryāya*, *rūḍhi*, *upacāra*, *saṃvṛtti*, *saṃāsa* etc.
- c) *vākyavakratā* (similar to *vākyadhvani*) encompasses all *alaṃkāras*.
- d) *prakaraṇavakratā* : *vakratā* occurring in only a part of the poetic work.
- e) *prabandhavakratā* : *vakratā* occurring in the whole poetic work.

Kuntaka further delineates three styles of poetic expression viz. *sukumāra* (tender / delicate) *vicitra* (variegated) and *madhyama* (middling); these are governed by the same two common merits viz. *aucitya* (propriety) and *saubhāgya* (grace, charm, loveliness).

The *Vakrokti* model is as comprehensive as *dhvani* and seeks to include the latter. ..

Like other models of poetic experience, *vakrokti* is based on the word functions *abhidhā* and *lakṣaṇā* because indirection or obliqueness can occur only relatively to these. *Svara*,

the unit of music does not have these functions. Therefore it does not possess the power of substitution, synonymity, explanation or metaphor. The only musical attribute of *svara* is *gamaka* which confers a variable shape and meaning. This is a contextual factor of *svara* and is unique to it. There is no *svara* in Indian music which is employed without *gamaka* except the fundamental. *Gamaka* is integral to the *svara* and is analogous to *abhidhāprakāra*viśeṣa of Kuntaka.

V. Rasa Theory

1. Application to Nāṭya and Kāvya

Of all Indian theories of aesthetic experience, the theory of *rasa* is the most ancient, most studied and discussed, and is also the most popular. It was first proposed to elucidate the experience of the theatre art but was soon adopted and adapted by poeticians to explain the art of poetry. It is so ubiquitous and widely accepted that it is often tacitly assumed to apply to the experience of other forms of art such as music, dancing, painting and sculpture. One of the purposes of this paper is to examine whether it is feasible to do so for music.

The earliest discussion of the theory of *rasa* is found in Bharatamuni's *Nāṭyaśāstram*. It is also the first systematic, comprehensive and analytical approach to explain the experience of the art of *nāṭya*. Though it recognizes the indivisible nature of the experience, it analyses the latter out of methodological necessity into physical, physiological and psychological dimensions and comes up with a comprehensive, plausible and pliable model. It is stated in the form of an aphorism. It is not known whether this is formulated by Bharatamuni or inherited by him. It is called *rasa-sūtra* and states '*vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicārisaṃyogād rasaniṣpattiḥ*' [*Rasa* is generated by the combination of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāri (bhāva)* (with *sthāyibhāva*)].

The basic premises of this theory are that the human mind constantly reacts with stimuli from its environment presented by the external world. Such reaction is termed *bhāva*. The stimulus, in the context of aesthetic experience is called *vibhāva*; physiological reaction to it is *anubhāva* (that which follows *bhāva*). The entirety of emotive tendency of the human mind is analysed into eight (or nine) modalities called *rati* (love), *hāsa* (humour), *śoka* (sorrow), *krodha* (anger), *utsāha* (energetic), *bhaya* (fear), *jugupsā* (repugnance) and *vismaya* (wonder). These are universal and abide in the human mind always. These are called *sthāyibhāva* (permanent, dominant mood). They may be aroused into the corresponding emotion if the circumstances and situations are conducive. The corresponding emotions are *śṛṅgāra*, *hāsa*, *karuṇa*, *raudra*, *vīra*, *bhayānaka*, *bībhatsa* and *adbhuta*. Another *sthāyibhāva* viz. *nirveda* corresponding to *śāntarasa* is also postulated. Other emotions such as *vātsalya*, *bhakti*, *laulya* and *brāhma* are also described by later authorities. But only the above mentioned eight (or nine) *rasas* (sentiments) are held to be adequate for *nāṭya* and *kāvya*. Just as the ocean has waves and beads are strung on a string to form a garland, numerous, accessory moods flit through the mind in transit. These are appropriately named *sañcāri* or *vyabhicāribhāvas*. These help the *sthāyibhāva* to assume varying postures of the same

rasa. The *vibhāva* loses its mundane status as a worldly stimulus when the poet or the actor transforms it with the magic of intuitive insight or genius into an out of the world significance and by the connoisseur by contemplation and imaginativeness (*bhāvanā*). *Vibhāva* is the stimulus, cause; *anubhāva* is the response, the effect. The former stimulates the latent *sthāyibhāva* and arouses it. *Anubhāva* is an expression of the action of this on the body as behavioural reaction. *Vyabhicāribhāva* sustains this state through suggesting many postures of the same *sthāyibhāva* by association. Thus intensified, *rasa* is realised. Such *rasa* differs from the corresponding mundane sentiment because it is neither functional nor utilitarian. Even though the sentiments derived from *nāṭya* or *kāvya* are eight or nine or their innumerable shades, *rasa* transcends them and is really one. Division into this or that sentiment such as *śṛṅgāra* or *karuṇa* is based on the difference in *sthāyibhāva*. In short, the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* relating to a poetic or dramatic situation combine with the *sthāyibhāva* and generate a *rasa* which sheds all its referential or mundane attributes and becomes totally relishable (*āsvādyā*). Bharatamuni drives home the meaning of the *rasasūtra* with two gustatory analogies. Just as a *śāḍava* (*pānaka*) is a combination of several ingredients such as sweet, sour, pungent, astringent and so on, the product has a flavour which is not an average of the flavours of the ingredients but their sum is greater than the sum of the parts. But the taste may be suited to an individual by manocovering their composition. Similarly, a gourmet relishes his food by mixing with the main item various side dishes of spices, vegetables etc.

The *rasa* aphorism which epitomises this psychoaesthetic theory is vague on several counts, probably by design. Indeed, this is true of most *sūtra* literature of the *śāstra* disciplines in Sanskrit. This is their essential merit; for, they accommodate widely differing view points and are responsible for the birth and growth of various philosophical systems. The *Brahmasūtras* are an example of this. The *rasa-sūtra* is a classical example of such vagueness :

1. Why and how is *bhāva* transformed into *vibhāva*?
2. How do *vibhāva*, *anubhāva* and *vyabhicāri bhāvas* combine with *sthāyibhāva*?
3. What is the nature of this *saṃyoga* - is it a mixture, a compound, a fusion?
4. What is the meaning of 'niṣpatti'?
5. Combination occurs with whose *sthāyibhāva*? the original hero, the actor or connoisseur?
6. Why is *sthāyibhāva* distanced from the *sūtra* in the text?

Such vaguenesses have given rise to varying interpretations of the selfsame *sūtra* by different commentators of the *Nāṭyaśāstram*. According to Lollaṭa Bhaṭṭa, an exponent

of *Pūrvamīmāṃsā śāstra*, *rasa* is *produced* in the hero or heroine; the spectator ascribes it to the actor because of the latter's skill in acting, but the spectator's delight (*āsvāda*) is based on the appreciation of the realistic acting. Śaṅkuka, an exponent of *Nyāya* (*Tarka*) holds *rasa* to be only inferred but not directly realized. The *sthāyibhāva* in the original hero is inferred to exist in the actor (though, in reality it does not). The spectator forgets the difference between the hero and the actor and infers *rasa* in the actor. He argues that *rasa* experience is wholly unlike any other mode of worldly knowledge viz. certainty, illusion, doubt and similarity. It is like that of a well pointed horse in a picture. But Lollaṭa and Śaṅkuka fail to explain how a tragic play, instead of producing sorrow in the spectator gives him aesthetic pleasure.

Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka was an expert in *Sāṃkhya* philosophy. According to him, the relish of *rasa* as aesthetic experience is subjective in the spectator. Poetic language differs from ordinary language; for, the poetic word has two functions viz. *bhāvakatva* and *bhojakatva* besides *abhidhā* (and *lakṣaṇā*). *Bhāvakatva* is the power of universalization (also called *sādhāraṇīkaraṇa*) which removes specifics in *vibhāva*, *sthāyibhāva* etc., and thus depersonalizes these components of the aesthetic experience. Thus these are generalized in the minds of spectators who have the power of imagination. Next, *bhojakatva* is the power by which *sthāyibhāva* is roused to a climax and is enjoyed by the spectators as an experience which cannot be described.

Abhinavagupta is a great exponent of the *Pratyabhijñā* school of (Kashmir) Śaivism. Following Ānandavardhana, he argues that *rasa* is realized through suggestion. According to him, the *sthāyibhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas* are latent in the spectator's mind; they are stimulated and roused by *vibhāvas* and are climaxed to *rasa*. *Rasa* is realized through *dhvani* (*vyañjanā*) and the experience is not indescribable. *Bhojakatva* is not mystic or mysterious but is the same as *vyañjanā*. *Rasa* is experienced in three stages; cognition of formal or intellectual elements of the poem (or *vācika* in a play), idealisation of the contents of poem or play by imagination (*bhāvanā*) of reader or spectator, climaxing of the inexpressible emotional condition of reader or spectator. When these are blended harmoniously, one predominant emotion emerges. Then both the intellectual and emotional elements appeal at the same time, and arouse the *sthāyibhāva* in the experient. Now the *āsvāda* of the *rasa* is manifested as one indivisible experience shedding all traces of the concomitants viz. *vibhāva* etc. Further, whatever the *sthāyibhāva* and its emotion, the *rasa* is always of the nature of *āsvāda* only.

This is lucidly summarised by Śārngadeva at the beginning of the discussion of *rasa* in the *nartanādhyāya* of his *Samgītaratnākara*;

Cognoscenti desire the triple art (of *gīta*, *vādyā* and *nṛtta*) to be prominent in *rasa*. So now we shall delineate *rasas* by the method of both generalisation and particularisation of the special features (of each *rasa*). *Rasa* abiding in the actor is of the nature of combination of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, *vyabhicāribhāva* with *sthayibhāva*. It does not have basis in one's self, another, friend or foe etc.; it is free from any differences due to distinctions of state of consciousness (e.g. wakeful), place and time, it is receptive only to *sthāyibhāva* such as *rati* and *hāsa*; because it has no impediments, it is founded on repose or reposefulness. It is distinct from intuition, sensation, recollection and other forms of awareness. It is dissimilar to the Brahman state of consciousness since it is based on various *sthayibhāvas* like *rati*. It is a blissful, self-revealing mode of consciousness called *āsvāda* (enjoyment, relish). Such is *rasa*.

A more detailed study of *rasa* is beyond the scope of the present paper.

2. Extension to Music

While examining the possibility of extending the foregoing *nāṭyārāsa*/*kāvya-rāsa* theory to music, the following considerations are relevant:

1. The structural elements of the theory such as *vibhāva*, dramatic elements such as dramatisation, actor and original hero/heroine are modified in the *Kāvya-rāsa* theory.
2. *Nāṭya* is a total theatre encompassing nearly all art forms as ancillary to the *rūpaka*. Bharatamuni himself abridges this view of *nāṭya* by reducing it to five limbs viz. the three *abhinaya-s*, *gīta* and *ātodya*, prescribing continuity and unity in their performance as in a burning fire brand. There is thus a part-whole relationship between music and *nāṭya*. Further, music is not required to be necessarily performed throughout a *rūpaka* or to be performed at least in part in every *rūpaka*. So the question is : Is a theory of the whole valid for each part and *vice versa*?
3. A very large part of Indian music, especially Karnataka music is composed and performed with words. Music is autonomous and of primary meaning when without words; it is subordinated to a secondary meaning when associated with words. This applies to songs in a play also.
4. Bharatamuni has prescribed specific *svaras* and various *dhruva* songs to specific emotive situations. Kaśyapa, Maṭaṅga, Nānyadeva, Śārṅgadeva and others have prescribed specific *rāgas* (in songs) to be performed for specific

emotive situations. But these are firmly and uniquely associated with *vācīkābhinaya* situations in a play. But even when music was performed in its own autonomy, this fossilized burden was lifted out of its context and was carried over in textual tradition till about the 17th-18th centuries. Music can only suggest, modulate, augment or emphasize word meanings but does not have an independent role in the evocation of *rasa*.

5. *Nāṭya-rasa* is postulated to explain the experience of visual (*drśya*) and aural (*śravya*) poetry; music cannot be defined as either.
6. As far as I am aware, an earnest, systematic attempt is yet to be made in the discussions of *rasa siddhānta* in *nāṭya* or *kāvya* to explain how *sthāyibhāvas* in poetic or dramaturgical situations differ from their mundane analogues, how they shed their specificities, how and why they are invariably and uniformly transformed into the selfsame *ānanda* in repose. This issue is fundamental to any discussion of the *rasa* theory in any aesthetic context. Śaṅkuka only implies it. Abhinavagupta and others have not included it in their argument but accept it as a self-evident axiom. This may have been confirmed by experience within limits of *sahṛdayatā* (connoisseurship) but does not have the infallibility of an unarguable axiom. A hypothesis or theory should be distinguished from axiomatic truth.

It is sometimes possible to simulate a *sthāyibhāva* such as *śoka* or *utsāha* by exaggerating or emphasising *gamakas* in a melodic passage beyond the limit of appropriateness (*aucitya*). Any affect resulting from it is like a shadow of its worldly analogous emotion and has no substance.

3. Musical Meaning and Emotion

In the context of music, it is useful to define meaning thus: Any thing becomes meaningful if it has a connection, indicates or refers to something beyond itself as a result of which its full nature points to this connection, which in its turn, reveals it. This definition is useful to classify meaning in two ways;

- a) A stimulus may acquire meaning if it refers to something which differs from itself in kind.
- b) A stimulus or process may become meaningful if it signifies or refers to itself or to something like itself. The latter is called embodied meaning.

Music may have both kinds of meaning. It may refer to things outside or beyond itself and evoke associations or notions belonging to the world of ideas, sentiments of physical objects i.e. songs composed with words and programme music. Meaning of this kind is often less precise or specific than the meanings of the words themselves. But, instead of weakening or obscuring the latter meaning, music may actually strengthen or augment word meaning/s through suggestion, association or imagination. Secondly, meaning in music may be embodied with the musical system itself. For example, in Indian music a tone has value or meaning always and only in relation to the fundamental (*ādhāraśruti*); the *aṃśasvarā* of a *rāga* acquires different meanings, values and functions contextually when it becomes *graha*, *nyāsa* etc.

Music is an aesthetic form when it is self-referent. It is an art of sounds. Its sounds cannot be interpreted as anything other than themselves. They are unlike the sounds of language because they cannot be understood as referring to anything beyond the realm of language sounds can and do; nor can they be arranged according to syntactical rules and order as in language. By hearing them, reference to, indication or representation in sensory areas other than the aural (e.g. visual) do not occur. Aesthetic experience of music is a learned response in the practiced and susceptible listener; it is a learned activity of the musician.

Music as an art has become possible because the human brain is endowed with certain capacities uniquely. Thus we can hear a tone as a sound which is distinct from speech sound or natural sound; we can distinguish and identify different speaking and singing voices, distinguish various classes of instrumental sounds and identify their individual members. We can hear them together and individually in a group. We can hear a series of sounds as a melody, recognize another as its variation, hear yet another as a concluding passage. We can hear by abstraction one or more rhythms in a melody. We can hear three or four tones at the same moment in their fusion and hear a progression of such fused tones (chords) as parts of a structure. We can include silences in melodic or harmonic series in a meaningful way. We can hear colours of sounds and textures of colours and tones. We can hear structures in terms of segmentation. We can hear imperfect tones as perfect tones because of the phenomenon of tone width. We can hear nonexistent tones, suggested, implied or illusory. These and peculiar modes of hearing do not have thought content. In *tāla* structured musical compositions we can hear and understand the spirality of temporal progression and unity of form and content. We can hear every and any tone during a melodic series in its anchoring to the reference tone. Music is an art in which we hear sounds in a form and form in sounds. Thus structural sounds and sound forms constitute the art of music as its very *raison d'être*. Musical experience is based totally on and only on mutually related modes of hearing sounds and sound patterns.

Musical value relates to music and to nothing else. It may be perceived and appreciated only by practised and susceptible listeners. Any other kind of enjoying music is only incidental and is even extraneous to the aesthetic. Word meanings and modes of feelings associated with such meanings do colour musical experience; such nonmusical contributions to musical experience are often prominent in Indian music but serve to dim or obscure the autonomy of the aesthetic experience *per se*. The value of music is intrinsic, not instrumental to music listening. Therefore the experience should be described or explained in terms of music only. The experience cannot be substituted with, or translated into anything else.

Again, music may express some specific or general emotion. In other words, music may express not only musical value (this is its primary value) but it may express other values also. This is very evident in Karnataka vocal music. In this latter sense, music may be regarded as a symbol of the state of mind such as one or more of the sentiments, e.g. *vīra*, *karuṇa* which are couched in poetical word content. I have shown elsewhere that this becomes possible through the overuse of *gamaka*. A musical element is employed to highlight or underline the content of a separate mode of art expression. This is then a secondary or auxiliary function of music. Even when bereft of word content, such exaggerated use of *gamaka* suggests referential or mundane emotion in an illusory, shadowy way. This is sometimes thought to be emotion specific and intrinsic to music. Exaggeration is indeed a poetic figure and helps in focussing or forcing attention to a specific part or aspect of expression. But it is neither the soul of poetry nor always indispensable. And it should be used within limits of aesthetic propriety if it is to be an effective, affective tool. This is true of exaggerated use of *gamaka* in music also.

4. Theory of Musical Aesthetics : A Proposal

Music is often described as a language of emotions. This analogy is valid only up to a point: Music can express a mood or emotion just as a complex, but single meaning emerges in a linguistic sentence through the *abhidhā* etc. triad (or quartette) of words and their temporal, syntactic sequence. The analogy cannot be stretched beyond this point because there are some fundamental and irreconcilable differences between music and language: musical notes and their rhythms (*svara-laya*) are not analogous with words; the former do not possess well defined functions such as *abhidhā* nor the facility of being explained in terms of other musical notes and rhythms as words have, nor do they possess synonyms, homonyms, homophones and antonyms. The purport of a linguistic sentence depends on the syntactical arrangement of words, their grammatical relationships and the suggestibility of words. This is not true of a musical sentence.

Drawing analogies - Musical note or phrase: word; grammar of language : grammar of music ; distinguishing musical usages: idiom, provincial usage etc., is unproductive in erecting an aesthetic model for music. The analogy between music and language is, I feel, inapplicable here in view of basic differences in the materials, methods, objectives, benefits and processes characterising them. Musical imagery is qualitatively different from poetical imagery. I have discussed elsewhere ('Meaning in Music') similarities and dissimilarities between language and music.

The physical attributes of rhythm (*laya*) also, like those of the musical note have the potentiality to express *sthāyibhāvas* like *śoka* (sorrow). It is well known that metrical rhythm (*chandas*) has many possibilities of expressing moods. It is common knowledge that skilful treatment of slow, middle and fast tempi can suggest, stimulate or simulate profound pain, excitement etc. As is true of *svara* kinesis and *svara* curvature, *laya* also stimulates attention and attraction. Monotonous or uniform rhythm tends to induce quietude or soporificity, while movement suggests activeness. Such are the abodes of *sthāyibhāvas*. Music produces both bodily and mental effects on listeners because of these physical attributes of *svara* and *laya*. Music listeners often say that they experience pleasure, enthusiasm, repose, merriness or happiness. It is common experience that these mental states possess neither the intensity nor the effect as those generated by stimuli of everyday life. This is true also of body behaviour in response to music.

In this connection, it is pertinent to notice a difference between art music and light (classical) or the so called *sugama* music. Any aesthetic form of any culture has the expression, or experience of beauty as its main purpose and the delineation of the erotic etc., emotions as a secondary, incidental purpose. The reverse is true of folk arts or applied arts. The origin and objective of folk arts are, in the main, the principal *sthāyibhāvas* which are natural to the human heart. This is why the apparatus, structure and materials are more or less common to all folk arts, especially to Folk music. Folk arts and applied arts appeal to the common readily for this reason. Aesthetic forms such as art music or art dancing magnify and lucidly express the beautiful unlike folk or applied art forms and diminish the *sthāyibhāva* content of the experience. Every aesthetic form develops its own apparatus, method, techniques and principles for the realization and expression of beauty within the framework of its parent culture. Each such form develops its own frontiers and traditions within a single culture while the same form generates different traditions of practice and theory in different cultures. Therefore, cultural background, prior exposure, habituation, rapport and nativity and other elements become desiderata for the experience of *rasa*, which is the *sine qua non* for any aesthetic form. The quality and intensity of such experience depend on the proportions of these elements. Because the materials, objectives and means are more

distant to the listener in his day-to-day life than those of a folk art, the appeal of the former to the common man is less. While listening to folk music the common man recognizes the familiar *vīra*, *śoka* etc., for *sthāyibhāvas* from his own everyday life and experiences them by personal association. But the attractions of art music include more refined and appealing sensory objects; the experiencing of *sthāyibhāvas* as well as the general delight arising from universalisation without the physical and mental necessity of actual participation in the worldly *vibhāvas* which stimulate these *sthāyibhāvas*.

It may be noted in this context that a physical medium is indispensable for the experience, expression and communication of beauty which is basically nonmaterial and accessible only to experience. The capacity of an aesthetic form for expressing beauty depends on the nature of its medium. The literal meaning and other functions of word in poetry, realism or likeness in painting and sculpture, the tone and its rhythm in music are indispensable media; yet they constitute opacities to aesthetic experience more or less according to their natures. The sentimental element is one such opacity in art music; it is an aid to aesthesis if it is within limits of appropriateness (*aucitya*) but damages the fundamental purpose if exaggerated beyond such limits. Every musician (including me) knows that during a creative performance of art music *per se* the element of *sthāyibhāva* is purely incidental or even nonexistent. The emotion experienced then is different, non-personal and non-sentimental. During the creative process, the mind of the artist, including the musician, is absorbed in technical activities, formulation of the formal elements and structure, and effervescent in the adventure of creation and realization of the beautiful form; it does not become turbid or drenched with sentimental extraneousities. If it is, artistry takes a back seat. Craft comes to the fore.

Music expression has many aspects: mental dispositions of the inner self are externalized in face, vocal inflexions etc. Music can signify verbal situations e.g. martial songs, sacred songs, dance songs etc. Just as primary meaning (*abhidhā*) may be conveyed by equating literal or word situations with hand poses (*mudrā viniyoga*), definite or particular equations may be erected in music also. Music may imitate phenomenal sounds e.g. song of the cuckoo. It can express, but cannot create, the emotions of sorrow, fear, anger, delight etc., if they already exist in the mind. Music is also a means of self expression. Some opine that this is indeed its primary obligation. It is possible to externalize or release mental tensions such as excitement, anger, pleasure, grief or anxiety and become reposeful through music. This is not unique to music because it may be accomplished by means which are extraneous to music and the other arts.

Rasa and *saundarya* are often equated or synonymised by Indian aestheticians. This is supported by Indian metaphysical thought which hold that *Brahman* is *Rasa* and is also

satyam, śivam and sundaram. Meaning in art as *rasa* or *saundarya* may be discussed from the viewpoint of symbolistic philosophy, according to which the fourfold, fundamental activities of the primitive human mind viz. music, magic, mime and sacrament result from the inherent, spontaneous capacity of the human mind to transform phenomenal, sensory input into symbols. This activity is unique to, and integral with the human mind. In other words, the human mind has the capacity to abstract a form or pattern out of the mélange of the sensory data presented by the physical world of sensory experience. Thus wavelengths of energy perceived by the eye are transformed into colour; wavelengths of energy perceived by the ear are transformed by the mind into sound, molecular aggregates are distinguished and become meanings to the mind as dimensions, shapes, colour, smell etc. Each experience so gained is transformed into a concept i.e. a symbol for an experience, with general, permutable and universally recognizable characteristics and with significative, denotative and connotative values. This is natural to the human mind. According to this theory, song and dance are the most natural, prelinguistic activities of the mind. Sound is conceptually transformed into tone, body movement as an abstracted form, recurrent dispositions and groupings as rhythm.

A pattern or configuration of symbols is the basis of meaning. Such pattern or configuration should satisfy certain criteria in order to be meaningful: The symbols must be familiar from previous, phenomenal experience. They should be organised into spatiotemporal distribution or configuration, resulting in a structure. This becomes possible through definite or specific, mutual relationships, explicit and implicit, among the neighbouring symbols such that the relationships converge into a focus. Such focus is meaning. In other words, when the concomitant elements in an experience are discerned by the mind as a pattern or configuration, it emerges as meaning. Discernment implies correlations and convergence of relationships to a focus. Discernment of a pattern also implies familiarity, that is, recollection of the same or similar experience. It also means the ability to select the relevant factors and rejecting the irrelevant. Discernment may be sequential or instantaneous, depending on the nature and arrangement of symbols. This is called discursive and presentational respectively. Language, music and dancing are instances of the former while painting, sculpture and architecture are those of the latter. Symbols of discursive meaning are restricted to reactions of adjacency and by one-to-one adjacency. Those in the presentational meaning are governed by centration or centripetal relationships. Realization of meaning involves recall and a funnelling of symbols. Each symbol has a unitary and complementary function in forming a pattern.

Whatever be the mode of mental grasp of the symbols, comprehension of the pattern involves relative movement between consciousness and the symbols in space and time. Consciousness is a stream of continuous (or quantised) mental energy; at least, its flow occurs in so closely occurring spurts that it may be regarded as continuous within limits of awareness of phenomenal awareness. Consciousness moves parallel to the symbols and abstracts a pattern out of them. The shape, structure and magnitude of the pattern are conditioned by the parity in magnitude and direction of the two movements, familiarity with the symbols, relative prominences of symbols and other related factors. Realization of meaning involves recall and coordination. Sometimes the process of abstraction occurs at an unconscious level; then the movements become contiguous. The pattern is richer or poorer in meaning depending on the efficiency of symbolic disposition, symbol familiarity and technique which are peculiar to the discipline.

The position of the experient can never be eliminated from the experience. Heisenberg's Principle of Uncertainty applies as much to animate existence as to the inanimate. The objective element in meaning derives mainly from the objective and general relationship inherent among the symbols themselves as well as those obtaining between the symbols and the experient. The more the personal involvement and participation by the experient, the more becomes the individual, peculiar and untranslatable the meaning. Meaning may be broadly divided into referential and nonreferential. If the latter pertains to beauty, the experience is of art. In music, meaning emerges from momentary serial symbols of tone and rhythm. Musical process therefore involves anticipation in the performer and recall in the listener.

5. Refutation of Theories of Emotion in Pure Music

Thus, a pattern or configuration is the source of meaning. What is the nature of this meaning? Is it autonomous to music - the very nature or quality of music, or is it emotional? In other words, does music communicate itself directly or does it express something which is extraneous viz. emotion?

There are, broadly speaking, two kinds of philosophical theories of music. According to one, the value of music as an art form and the different values which different musical compositions have can be explained in terms of something which lies outside music itself, in which we have an interest independent of music. The most common thing which is generally thought to be connected with music is emotion. Emotion is undoubtedly of great concern to us outside of music; equally undoubtedly, music has the great power to move us to emotion; in such musical compositions which are experienced to be

emotional, the emotional quality is heard in the music itself. Because emotion lies outside music, such theories hold that the value of music is emotion. The second kind of theories propose that the value of music as an art form is purely musical; it does not lie in anything which music may function referring to something which in turn refers to something outside music. Therefore it is not necessary to experience a musical work referring to anything nonmusical in order to understand and appreciate its value as music. So, the value of music is essentially unrelated to emotion.

Exponents of the theory which proposes that musical value is emotion hold either that music transmits emotion or that music expresses emotion. The first view implies that music is only a medium or vehicle and that emotion is what music is intended to transmit. So music has only a secondary role. The second has many varieties but is weak because of the inadequacy of its essential idea. According to this view, the artist, when creating a work of art, has an experience which he wishes to transmit or communicate to others, so that they also may have the same experience. To accomplish this, he needs to externalise his experience. This is made possible by creating or imagining an object which may be perceived by others e.g. a building, a sculpture, a painting, a complex of musical sounds and rhythms, a complex of body movements. This is designed in such a way that whosoever experiences it in the right way also has the same experience which the artist wishes to transmit. He hopes by such externalization that he passes on to others his experience which is inside him. The work of art has value if the experience he wishes others to have is worth experiencing and if he is successful in his attempt. The content of expression is different from the mode of expression; therefore the intrinsic nature of expression should be characterised without reference to the medium or mode of the object. The exponents of expression-transmission theory hold that the expression in music is moods, feelings and emotions. This is done through sounds and rhythms which are transformed or translated back into moods etc. in the listener. This involves the reduction of musical expression to elements to a musical lexicon such that it bears a correspondence to the elements of moods, feelings and emotions; in Indian music, the lexicon would correspond to *svara*, *varṇālaṅkāra*, *sthāya*, *ākṣiptikā* etc. of *ālāpa* which are transformed into emotive expression through *gamaka*, *kāku*, rhythms etc. which are suitably highlighted or emphasized. These are musical devices; this is highly influenced by emotive word content which is an extra-musical factor. This latter is dominant in the overall expression and pushes music to a secondary, augmentative, suggestive, stimulative or simulative role. Music, however, is not a true language for it lacks *abhidhā*, *lakṣaṇā* and *vyañjanā* in its unit viz. the *svara* as well as syntactical relationships. Further, this theory separates what gives value to the music (the experience it transmits from the composer/performer to the listener) from the music

itself. It represents a musical work as related in a certain way to an experience which can be completely characterised omitting the nature of the work itself. Therefore music becomes only a tool or an instrument, the function of which is to arouse in the listener what the composer or performer wishes him to feel. Thus, it is the emotion which is the value, not the music. It is the emotion which the composer or performer experiences, transmitted by musical expression to the listener, which is central to both and not the music itself. Therefore this theory misrepresents the nature of the value of music to the listeners. It misleads the listener into believing that he could still have the experience without understanding or appreciating the musical work itself, even as the composer/performer had before designing the music work. This is not true because there is no such experience for the listener without the musical work itself. So music is in this theory, like a transparent container which takes on the colour of what is poured into it. The value of the music is not what it arouses in the listener, it is the music itself. The separation of music from the emotion which the theory postulates makes it unable to explain why music has a general appeal and why music has appeal when expressing particular emotions. So, if such theory is to be satisfactory, it must explain what it is for music to be expressive of emotion, what it is for music to be heard as expressive of emotion and what kinds of value can attach to musical expressiveness.

Again, the music composer, when creative, has an experience, say emotion. He may have it before he composes, while he composes or when the composition is performed. The listener is not concerned with his emotion because he is not aware of it unless he hears the composition directly from the composer. If he does, the composer is only a performer for the listener. What the listener normally hears is, in any case, only the performer's version of the composition and is therefore exposed only to his experience and his interpretation. This varies from performer to performer and from one listening to another. So the listener does not have a constant frame of reference except the skeletal material which the performer inherits from the composer. The performer feels only an episodic emotion or an emotion stimulated by the words and / or music. The listener is not aware of the former. The latter is variable in detail. If the composition is loaded with words, the quality of the experience is proportional to the power of the music (*dhātu*) to evoke, suggest, augment or emphasize the word meaning (*mātu*). Such harmonization between music and word meanings is very rare in art music in which the two originate from more or less independent resources within the composer and the chief concern is realization of the beautiful form. Such marriage occurs generally in the light classical (or '*sugama*') music in which the grammar is less rigorous and the chief concern is the communication of a lyrical or poetic idea or thought through music. Composers and performers of art music who are *dhātu oriented* rarely pay attention to the word

meanings, their attention is focussed on the grammatical, idiomatic and technical aspects of the music in their creative moments of composing or performance. Their mental activities are full of in spirit of seeking, adventure, spontaneity and subconscious selection, organization and techniques of expression. These are suffused with vigour and emotion of a totally impersonal nature. There is hardly any room for a personal emotion or a sentiment like *vīra*, *karuṇa*, *śṛṅgāra* etc. during such activity. If the word meanings suggest or involve such emotions they are usually sublimated to *bhakti* or love of God. This may be transmitted to the listeners in varying degrees of receptivity. In any case, such emotion or sentiment is clearly extraneous to the music. This is true of any emotion which the performer feels, or chooses to express through music. If he exaggerates the techniques of expression such as *gamaka*, *kāku*, tempo, dynamics etc. beyond the limits of propriety, music ceases to be an art and becomes a personal tool.

Now, a theory expounding that music arouses both meaning and emotion may be briefly discussed.

Just like an uttered word, a musical work may be understood, misunderstood or not understood when heard. Unless it is understood, the listener cannot estimate the value of music (which may be, *per se*, rewarding) and so cannot realize it in experience. Any thing is of value only when understood and realized in experience. He can understand the music only if he hears it in a particular manner as intended by the composer / performer. This is the only way in which the composer / performer can communicate his experience to the listener. Such particular manner of listening is integral to the value of the work of music and cannot be isolated from it.

What is the nature of this experience? In order to understand the kind or kinds of experience which the composer / performer transmits to the listener it is necessary to characterise the experience in greater detail, providing two things viz. a) a theory of understanding it; b) a theory of its value. Its value is determined for the listener basically by the intrinsic value of the music. Such characterization, effected through analysis, should involve the basic musical elements of melody and rhythm (*rāga* and *tāla* in Indian music) and their concomitants (e.g. *rāgadaśaprāṇa*, *tāladaśaprāṇa* *gamaka*, *kāku*, distinguishing features) from which the various forms of the music system become possible.

Music has both an absolute and a referential meaning according to this theory. The absolute meaning is intramusical, referring solely to the patterns and relationships inside the work of music. This is the more important of the two. The referential meaning refers to the relationship of the work to extramusical phenomena (e.g. word meanings, sounds of nature).

Is the intramusical (or absolute) meaning intellectual (formal) or emotional (expression) in nature? The theory attempts to answer this question by applying some canons of Information Theory according to which the dichotomy appears when viewed separately from the Formal and Expression Theories of music. If the value in music is the emotion it arouses, it is necessary to explain a) the nature of emotion and b) conditions under which it is aroused. This is done by postulating that emotion or general affect is aroused when a tendency to respond to a stimulus is arrested or inhibited. Tendency to respond may be in the form of a thought or activity. This postulate is the core of the theory.

This postulate implicitly assumes that arresting or inhibition of a tendency is both a sufficient and necessary condition for arousing affect or emotion. But it may readily be seen that it is neither. For, there are many occasions when faced with a stimulus, tendency to respond may not be arrested or inhibited. The tendency may not have an opportunity to be inhibited; it may be stillborn. Yet, emotion is not aroused. Similarly, it is not a necessary condition, since there are many emotions that are not aroused when a tendency to respond is arrested or inhibited. For example, admiration, amusement, joy and pride can be responses to a situation but do not depend on there being a tendency to some other frustrated response or a tendency which is prevented from being completed. Also, emotion is frequently experienced when things happen as one wishes or when one does exactly as one wants to. In either case, emotion need not be experienced because a tendency to respond is inhibited or arrested.

The above theory of emotion seems to be based on mundane or referential emotion aroused in everyday life when the experient is aware of a stimulus. He experiences a differentiated affect or emotion i.e. the nature of the emotion is different as the stimulant and situation are different. But it is quite common experience that the emotion aroused by music is quite different in quality from the emotions of the transactional world. It may be remembered at this point that Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's theory of universalization of *vibhāvas* (*sādharaṇīkaraṇa*) and its adaptation by Abhinavagupta have anticipated and solved just this problem.

Argument of the central postulate of this theory viz. arousal of affect or emotion when a tendency to respond to a stimulus is arrested or inhibited is weak on several counts; some of these may be briefly pointed out. First, the transition from general emotion to musical emotion is sought by construing an expectation to explain a tendency to respond as an automatic response pattern. It is in the nature of music that it creates expectations in the learned listener. But these expectations (conscious or unconscious) are not automatic response patterns because they do not occur as a succession of a well ordered series of mental or behavioural responses in a determined order at determined intervals

unless arrested one way or another. Frustration of such expectations do not necessarily arouse emotions. Second, it is argued that delayed fulfillment of an expectation creates uncertainty and tension, synonymising tension with emotion. Every emotion does not include a tension; every tension does not generate an emotion. Third, it is argued that more emotion is released if more tension is accumulated and resolved. It is a misrepresentation to say that the release of emotion felt when tension is resolved is from the release from emotion. It is more correct to say that it is the release of emotion, since discharge of tension is experienced along with emotion. But such release of emotion is not produced by inhibition of a tendency or an expectation; it is released because the tendency / expectation is fulfilled in course of time. Therefore the affect or emotion posited by this theory cannot be identified with the experience of tension because the emotion experienced on the resolution of tension has no tension in itself.

One more aspect of the foregoing expression theory of music is related to the emotion of reheard music. Increasing familiarity with the same work of music (e.g. rehearing recorded music) decreases more and more the significance and emotional impact of music. This is because music becomes meaningful when it creates expectations which are suspended or delayed for the time being as the music progresses, deviating more or less from its expected course. If the same work of music is heard again and again, the unexpected becomes expected, vaguenesses become more and more definite, uncertainties turn into certainties, expectations which were delayed in fulfillment or not fulfilled at all will give rise to more accurate expectations. So musical significance decreases if the degree of probability of the musical event increases and *vice versa*. Similarly emotional experience of the music decreases as its familiarity increases. Yet, art musical experience seems to contradict this; for more and more the art music is the heard, the more and more it seems to be moving.

The foregoing theory attempts to concile this contradiction with four explanations;

- a) With repeated hearing the listener tends to forget the lesser well-structured parts of the work, regularises in his own mind the irregular parts, so that many parts of it, including those which arouse affect or interest are prone to remain unexpected.
- b) The listener's expectations depend on his past musical experience. So each hearing affects the expectations, however slightly.
- c) If the listener rehears the music from a recording, the focus of his attention tends to shift in details every time to the extent what the state of his mind is and what his interaction with his own environment is; thus he discovers new

things of interest at every new rehearing. So the old and the familiar tend to appear as new and less familiar. Art music has this potentiality to arouse subjective reactions in the listener. If the listener rehearses a work of music from a live performance, there will be many variants in individual performances even with a fixed score. Where there is no fixed score, as is the case with Indian music, variation in the same work of music from one performer to another and from one performance to another in the same musician is of the very essence, nature and strength of the system.

- d) The listener can suspend his knowledge of the musical work and open himself up anew to its expectations and surprises. This results in an experience in which the expectations will be fulfilled as vaguely and imperfectly as when he was less familiar with it.

The foregoing considerations lead to a logical question the answer to which is not certain. The question is, if rehearing continues to a point when the listener's memory of the musical work is perfect in every detail, does the work cease to be interesting and emotional? The answer is apparently, Yes, if the work is simple and short. For, the expectations, interest potential (novelty) and emotion arousal are relatively limited. But if the work becomes longer and more and more complex, the affirmative becomes less and less emphatic.

The foregoing theory emphasizes the importance of syntactical form of music i.e. music composed and heard in a form which is structured according to the mutual relationships of its components and rules of its (own) grammar to the exclusion of its other contributions such as the sensuous. A second question pertinent to this argument is whether the syntactical aspect of musical structure the only one which gives value to the music or there are other contributory factors also.

Let me finally return to the theory of *rasa*. The *rasa* model is frankly proposed for aesthetic emotion which is inspired and derived from situations which may be described in words, such as play and poetry. Bharatamuni emphasizes the role of the word in a play throughout the *Nāṭyaśāstram*. All aesthetic thought on poetry is rigorously and exclusively limited to word situations. Aesthetic theory in both analyses the experience into physical, physiological and mental components in which the physical stimulus is transformed by imagination in a process of universalisation into the roots of aesthesis. In all this, music has only a minor, ancillary or incidental role. It is clearly an intruder to this theoretical model. The nature of music is very different from that of language or poetry and precludes a whole-part relationship in any aesthetic model. The *alātacakra*

(firebrand) analogy offered by Bharatamuni is only to emphasize the need of centration of all ancillary parts of the experience to a focus of *rasa* which is fundamentally based on, differentiated by, and unified by the powers of the word. That music has no place in such theory is indisputably clear from the words of Abhinavagupta while concluding his refutation of Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's commentary on the *Rasasūtra*. Abhinavagupta summarises his view of *rasa* thus in his *Abhinavabhāratī*:

‘(Therefore, *rasa*) is manifested in poetry by the absence of faults and presence of *guṇa* (quality, merit) and *alaṃkāra* (figuration) and in *nāṭya* in the form of the fourfold *abhinaya* (representation). It can remove intense stupidity and sorrow, can bring about universalization in *vibhāva* etc; it is imaginatively contemplated through the function of imagination (*bhāvakatva*) which emerges immediately after the denotative power (*abhidhāśakti*) [of the word]; it is different from (mundane) experience and from mental modalities such as memory; it is compounded of the three primordial qualities of *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*; it is of the nature fluidity (*druti*), evolution blooming/melting/softening (*vikāsa*) and expansion (*vistāra*); it is luminous (radiant) and blissful (rapturous) (*ānanda*) because of the dominance of the *sattva* (quality); it finds repose in realisation and is akin to the relish of the experience of *parabrahman*.’

Almost immediately after this, he elucidates the configuration of *rasa* through the trifold powers of the word:

‘The powers viz. *abhidhā*, *bhāvanā* and *bhogīkṛta* (actually experienced) are known to be the functions of the word. Among them, primary meaning and figurative meaning are manifested in the form of *abhidhā* at first. Then *śṛṅgāra* etc. mental states are contemplated by means of universalization through the function of *bhāvanā*; it is then experienced in a special way (*bhogīkṛta*). by spectators endowed with imaginativeness in the form of *rasa*.

Śārngadeva, who closely follows Abhinavagupta clinches the matter beyond doubt. At the end of Nartanādhyāya of his *Samgītaratnākara* he commences a description and discussion of *rasa* because the cognoscenti desire the triple art (of *gīta*, *vādya* and *nṛtta*) to be prominent in *rasa*; he deals with *rasa* abiding in the *naṭa* (actor; NOT musician or dancer) in terms of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, *vyabhicāribhāva* and *sthāyibhāva* represented through the fourfold *abhinaya*. The nature of *rasa* is such that, he says; ‘It does not have basis in one's self, another, a friend or a foe etc.; it is free from any differences due to distinctions of state of consciousness, space and time, it is receptive only to the *sthāyibhāva* such as *rati* and *hāsa*; because it has no impediments, it is founded on

repose or restfulness. It is distinct from intuition, sensation, recollection and other forms of awareness. It is dissimilar to the brahman state of consciousness since it is based on various *sthayibhāvas* such as *rati*. It is blissful, a self-revealing mode of consciousness called *āsvāda* (relish, enjoyment). Such is *rasa*.'

It is thus evident that he is speaking of *rasa* in the same sense as Bharatamuni did, restricting it to drama or poetry, but not relating it to music.

It has been mentioned above that Abhinavagupta, while summarising Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka's views on *rasa* says that *rasa* is of the nature of *druti* (melting/softening), *vikāsa* (blossoming, evolving) and *vistāra* (expanding). This is a description of the state of the mind when it is experiencing *rasa*. Whenever the mind is immersed in the affairs of the mundane world, it becomes hard, shut in and contracted. *Rasa* transforms the mind as a result of which it is softened, opened up and is expanding. This view is sought by some contemporary scholars to be erected into a general model of *rasa* in order to explain the experience of all art. I feel that this is not a productive endeavour.

In the first place, this does not describe the state of the entire mind in a *rasa* situation. These are only three aspects, and like *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas* are exclusive to *rasa* alone, but are found in different degrees in other mental states also e.g. the spiritual. Secondly, this proposal is methodologically insufficient. Any hypothesis or theoretical model should be able to explain all or at the least, most of the known facts of the related phenomena. So, this model should be able to explain both general *rasa* from another. These three mental states viz. *druti*, *vikāsa* and *vistāra* should explain alone or together how and why aesthetic emotion is different from the mundance, analogous emotion. The proposal should offer a mechanism as to how these operate in bringing about *rasa* experience. Indeed they are rather the effects of *rasa* than its causes.

Druti, *Vikāsa* and *Vistāra* are postulated in the context of *Kāvyarasa* and *nāṭyarasa* but not for nonreferential *rasa* as of music which is qualitatively different from that of word-situations (e.g. pure music, pure dancing, modern painting and sculpture). A theory should include or suggest methodological approaches with which it may be validated. IF it is a general theory of *rasa* which is applicable to experiences of different art forms, both visual and aural, it should provide for their differences in symbolic materials, methods and techniques. It should also be able to provide or suggest answers to the epistemological, methodological and other questions raised at the beginning of this study.

Until such time, the foregoing attempt cannot be accorded the status of a theory.

Before concluding a discussion of *rasa*, it may not be out of place to indicate here briefly scientific attempts in recent times to quantify emotion. These are based on the argument that while the so called 'physical proofs' can only define the form, aesthetic content cannot be measured satisfactorily by many 'so-called' scientific methods. So methods are being evolved to quantify only such elements (of what is essentially a subjective experience) which are objective, common to both individuals and groups, notwithstanding the fact that the data so obtained may not be conceptualized through statistical analysis. Such data await the development of precise instrumentation needed to observe and measure mental modalities such as aesthesis and to quantify aesthetic stimulus and emotional reaction.

At present, the methods of quantification of emotion in an aesthetic context are based on measuring tactile reaction to an aesthetic stimulus such as a melodic form. The EEG (electro encephalogram) is used in Forensic Psychology by the method of patternment of reactions. This is claimed to be superior to the earlier GSR (Galvanic Skin Reaction) method. Other instruments such as fMRI (Functional Magnetic Resonance Image) and PET (Positron Emission Tomography) and UST (Ultrasonotomography) which were originally developed as imaging diagnostic tools in medicine are being used in laboratories of Applied Psychology for the purpose of characterizing psychosomatic and other parameters. Mapping and quantification of emotional response is being experimented with the PET.

Amongst such attempts, the sentograph designed by Manfred Clynes deserves particular attention. "It is a machine which directly transduces rapidly accelerating and decelerating curves of muscular tension which are naturally associated with the expression of emotion into a form in which it can be communicated musically. Clyne defines sentiform (or dynamic forms) as 'language elements of a natural, biologically evolved language of communicating and generating emotions'. These are genetically programmed into the central nervous system and can be stored and recognized by computers and robots. They can serve as basis of real-time emotional communication between them and human beings. Music and art also utilize these forms to store and embody emotional meaning. A double stream theory of music is outlined including two principles of unconscious musicality, which can be realized on a computer, allowing one to create first-rate meaningful interpretations without manual performance or dexterity. New social opportunities and dangers are discussed arising from stimulation and virtual reality, which may exceed the average human in emotional eloquence. Real-Real-Time is introduced as a concept to include human time consciousness".

Based on the observations of Alain Danielou, Joyce Cary and Robert Lundin, N. Raghu has developed a mathematical model which he calls a 'Relational hypothesis'. If *rasāṃśa* (R) is emotional response, it is postulated as a product of a function of standard deviation of the frequencies of the scale of a *rāga* σ_n and a function of the tempo factor T.

$$R \propto f(\sigma_n) \cdot f(T)$$

He also develops the notion of what he calls emotional coefficients for each of the notes of the scale of a *rāga*. Both *rasāṃśa* and emotional coefficients yet need to be tested and validated. (For details, see N.Raghu : *Rasāṃśa : A new Hypothesis in Indian Music*, Pub. Performing Arts Research Centre, Bangalore, 2001).

V. Aucitya

1. Aucitya in Kāvya

I shall now take up the last model of literary criticism in Sanskrit viz. *Aucitya*. This term is variously translated into English as adaptation, propriety, appropriateness, decorum, suitability, convenience and 'Ucita' from which this word is derived has several lexical equivalents viz. delightful, pleasurable, agreeable; customary, usual; proper, suitable, convenient; acceptable, fit or right to be taken etc. The term 'proper' is preferred in this discussion.

Even though the word *aucitya* enters Sanskrit poetics in about the 8th cent. A.D., and in Sanskrit Theory of Grammar in c.7th cent. A.D., the principle of propriety or appropriateness has been well recognised from the earliest times in the recorded history of literary criticism in India. For example, Bharatamuni states that merits and faults do not have an absolute or intrinsic value in themselves in poetry but are to be determined as such by their situational appropriateness. A fault becomes a merit if used on the right occasion in the right place; a merit becomes a fault if used on an inappropriate occasion and in a wrong place. Though Bharatamuni is speaking of *Kāvya* here, he emphasizes the principle of appropriateness and extends it to the whole of *nāṭya* throughout the *Nāṭyaśāstram*. Foremost exponents of beauty and embellishment (*alaṅkāra*) such as Vāmana, Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha are emphatic and explicit in extolling the importance of propriety in poetry. For instance, Bhāmaha avers that a fault is transformed into a poetic merit if used properly in the right situation, as for example, collyrium enhancing the beauty of the eye; repetition adds to effectiveness in joy, fear etc. Daṇḍin states that merits and faults are determined by the poet's skill and are therefore not be permanently labelled as such.

The earliest known use of the word '*aucitya*' is found in Yaśovarman (early 8th cent. A.D.) in his play '*Rāmābhyudaya*' and is quoted by Bhoja. The cited passage insists on the prime importance of propriety in everything in a play, such as words, characters and *rasa*. Bhartṛhari (c. 7th Cent. A.D.) employs the word '*aucitya*' to indicate that among the multiple meanings of a word, the appropriate one should be selected. It is not improbable that this term migrated to poetics from linguistics in Sanskrit.

The evolution of *aucitya* may be accommodated in four phases viz.

- i. recognition of its principle without naming it so.
- ii. its mention by Yaśovarman.
- iii. its recognition in textual tradition by Rudraṭa and
- iv. its elaboration and application at the hands of Ānandavardhana and Kṣemendra.

Rudraṭa seems to take *vyutpatti* as a synonym of *aucitya* and includes it among the generating causes of poetry. *Vyutpatti* is described as discernment between appropriate and inappropriate (*yuktāyuktaviveka*). His commentator Namisādhū explains it as special awareness of what is proper and improper (*ucitānucitaparijñānam*). While delineating *vṛttis* (modes of diction), he cautions the poet to employ them or discard them strictly on the basis of *aucitya*. He says that dictional modes such as alliteration may often be a distracting influence on the poet, may cloud his judgement and should be therefore used with regard to *aucitya*, and should not be indulged in and allowed to become an end in themselves. Again, difficult *alaṃkāras* such as *yamaka* should be used only with caution. Namisādhū clearly brings out Rudraṭa's concern when he comments that *alaṃkāras* like *yamaka* and *śleṣa* blur aesthetic experience especially in the context of tender sentiments such as *śṛṅgāra* and *karuṇa* and therefore need to be positioned with great care in a poetical work. Rudraṭa's contribution to both *aucitya* and *kāvya* is even greater because it paved the way to a more elaborate and systematic treatment of the subject by later masters such as Ānandavardhana, Abhinavagupṭa, Kṣemendra and others.

As mentioned earlier, Ānandavardhana brought a new focus to Sanskrit literary criticism through *dhvani* and its role in the experience of *rasa*. His chief contribution lies in projecting *aucitya* as the integrating force which binds together the concomitants of aesthetic experience such as *alaṃkāra*, *guṇa*, *rīti* as converging into a single, indivisible experience. He highlighted *aucitya* as a criterion of aesthetic experience thus : 'the word *ucīta* reveals the appropriateness of the components in relation to *rasa* and to *rasa* alone; this in turn suggests that suggested *rasa* (*rasadhvani*) alone constitutes the soul of poetry. The idea is that in its absence there would be left nothing like a norm in relation to which appropriateness is claimed time and again.'

Kuntaka was an *antarbhāvavādin* i.e. he did not regard *dhvani* as a principal aesthetic model but included it as a component of *vakrokti*. He relates *aucitya* to *abhidhāvaicitrya* or artistically employed denotative meaning. He postulated three paths of poetic expression viz. *sukumāramārga*, *vicitramārga* and *madhyamamārga* and defines each with certain qualities or merits which are modified according to the *mārga*. He further delineates two qualities which are common to all these viz. *aucitya* and *saubhāgya*. Thus *aucitya* is quality which must necessarily be present in all three *mārgas*. He further divides *aucitya* into '*ucitākhyāna*' '*vācyam śobhātisāyinā*' both of which intensify poetic expression. Kuntaka stresses that *aucitya* should always conduce to *rasa* so that the latter is highlighted. He describes the importance of both *śabda* and *artha* in Kāvya of these, the primacy and ultimacy of *artha* is equated to *aucitya* in *artha*; he describes *aucitya* of syllable in word analogous to *varṇavakratā*. One more contribution of Kuntaka is the dictum of euphony: viz. that an important aspect of *aucitya* is the euphonic use of language.

Rājaśekhara introduces a new concept '*pāka*' (ripeness - maturity) into Sanskrit poetics. It is described as such a high degree of maturity that no words or ideas in the poetic work can be replaced. This is analogous to *aucitya* and may be called *aucityaprajñā*. Only the discerning, perceptive connoisseur can appreciate it. The different *pākas* are only the different degrees of propriety in different poets in different *kāvyas* and in different degrees of maturity in the same poet during his lifetime.

Mahimabhaṭṭa is a pungent critic of Kuntaka; he says that *vakrokti* is identical with *aucitya* or *dhvani*. *Rasa* experience is the ultimate objective of all poetry and it is achieved with *aucitya*. All *doṣas* are cases of *anaucitya* and are of two kinds viz. internal and external (related to *artha* and *śabda* respectively). Both are hindrances to the manifestation of *rasa*. *Aucitya* is integral with *rasa* and holds the key to explaining the *rasa-rahasya*.

Bhoja has nothing to add to the concept of *aucitya* despite his voluminous writing on *rasa*, probably because the notion of *aucitya* was just developing in his time. Mammaṭa is one of the most profound exponents of *kāvyarasa*; he established the *dhvani* model and validated it from the viewpoints of multiple disciplines. But he left *aucitya* untouched, except perhaps in that while *rasādi* is based on the positive application of *aucitya*, *rasābhāsa* occurs if the poet intentionally breaks the rule of decorum. Paṇḍitarāja Jagannātha is another colossus in Sanskrit Poetics but his contribution to *aucitya* is negligible. He also opines that *anaucitya* should not be eschewed if it helps in heightening *rasa*. He delineates *rasābhāsa* on the basis of *aucitya*.

There is a school of thought in Sanskrit poetics, headed by Abhinavagupta that *aucitya* does not merit the status of a separate, independent aesthetic model but should be esteemed as an all-embracing factor which harmonises all components of aesthetic experience so that *rasa* is its *summum bonum*. It is interesting that his disciple Kṣemendra esteems *aucitya* as a separate, independent aesthetic doctrine and, is unique in this respect. It is not that he ignores the importance of *rasa*; on the other hand, *rasa* remains his focus, but the focus shifts from *alaṃkāra*, *rīti* and *dhvani* to *aucitya* as the very soul and lifeblood of *rasa* and as the generating cause of *camatkāra* (the flash of beauty). He subordinates *alaṃkāra*, *guṇa* and other concomitants to *aucitya*; *rasa* remains the quintessential, core element of poetic experience; *aucitya* is its very life breath. This is quite in harmony with Abhinavagupta's '*aucityavad rasadhvaniḥ*'. He upholds Ānandavardhana's view that there is no cause of disruption of *rasa* other than *anaucitya*. He defines *ucita* as that which is suitable to what. He enumerates as many as twentyseven elements of a work of poetry which should satisfy the *aucitya* criterion, and illustrates each. These are *pada* (word), *vākya* (sentence), *prabandhārtha* (purport of the

work), *guṇa* (merit), *alaṃkāra* (figure), *rasa* (aesthetic emotion), *kriyā* (verb, action), *kāraka* (nominal inflexion), *liṅga* (gender), *vacana* (number), *viśeṣaṇa* (qualifying term), *upasarga* (affix), *nipāta* (particle), *deśa* (province, space), *kāla* (tense), *kula* (clan, lineage), *vrata* (conduct, austere observance), *tattva* (principle), *sattva* (strength of character), *abhiprāya* (intention/opinion), *svābhāva* (innate nature), *sārasaṃgraha* (quintessence), *pratibhā* (intuitive genius), *avasthā* (phase), *vicāra* (procedure/consideration/conjecture), *nāma* (name) and *āśīṣa* (benediction / praise).

2. *Aucitya* in Music

Aucitya is not a criterion of literary criticism alone. It is necessary to observe it in the everyday life of the mundane world also (*vyavahāraṇiṣṭha*) if one is to achieve harmony and equilibrium between the inner world and outer world. This is possible only by eschewing every kind of excessiveness and walking a middle path between too little and too much. This is possible only when one has a sense of poise and propriety, avoiding incongruities. *Aucitya* belongs to no specific category or aspect of life, but to all life. It is therefore not surprising that its value is stressed in art, for, the end product of all art endeavour is *rasa* which purifies and ennobles the soul.

Music is no exception. Just as the poet is the central figure in poetry, the composer and performer are central to music. Composer, performer and musicologist were not separate, compartmentalized individuals in India till comparatively recently. Textual tradition (*śāstrasampradāya*) prescribes some twentyeight qualities desirable in a composer (and performer). These may be classified under two heads viz. *prakhyā* (basic creative resources) and *upākhyā* (their communication) as follows:

I. *Prakhyā*

1. *Word* : Grammar, lexicon, metrical variety, figuration, linguistics.
2. *Music* : Expertness in *gīta*, *vādyā*, *nṛtta*; knowledge of *laya*, *tāla*, *kalā*, mature knowledge of musical forms, scholarship of *gamaka* in all three registers; skill in performance of different varieties of *ālapti*.
3. *Originality* : innovation, creativity, all pervading genius, eschewing plagiarism, composing of ever new melodies, adapting different word structures to the same music, composing in fast tempo (or speedy composition).
4. *Wordly knowledge* : Contemporaneity, dexterity in popular (or exotic, folk) music, skill in (composing / performing in) popular *rāgas*.
5. *Beauty - Consciousness* : aesthetic personality, capacity to understand *rasa*

and *bhāva*, abandoning anger and hatred, full of feeling, knowing propriety (*ucitajñatā*), knowing the minds of others.

6. *Mental Power* : Focussing of mind, intelligence, memory and the senses at a single point (*avadhāna*).

7. *Theoretical knowledge* : Expertness in the theory of the arts.

II. *Upākhyā*

Appealing voice, charming singing, discerning use of many *kākus*, stage-presence, competence in speaking, scholarship in *gamakas* in all three registers.

It may be noted that the composer's needs spread over many areas in both words and music. He is enjoined to be learned in *aucitya* which is traditionally related to *rasa* and *bhāva* in *saṃgītaśāstra* also. Therefore, all the foregoing discussion on *aucitya* applies to the poetic element in the word content of the songs. All the foregoing sources may be related to *aucitya* and *anaucitya* directly or indirectly.

However, as indicated above, *aucitya* should extend to the musical content also. The essence of *aucitya* here lies in proper proportion, balance, sense of propriety, avoidance of excessiveness as well as abstaining from too little and too much.

Some areas of music performance which deserve careful application of *aucitya* are : balance between words and music, between melodic and rhythmic content, between main music and accompanying music, between tempi, between word-music and wordless music (e.g. *ālāpana*, *neraval*, *kalpanā-svara*), between creative and inherited music (between length of composition and *manodharma* elements), proportion of *rāga*, *vāggeyakāra*, language variety, appropriateness of *gamaka*, avoidance of understatement and overstatement of *gamaka*, balance between 'scholarly' and 'popular' elements and so on. I am sure many more items may be added to this list.

The word *ucita* occurs in at least two more contexts in *saṃgītaśāstra*: 1) as-the descriptive name of one of the (twelfth) word-phrases of the musical form called *elā*. The second is the name of the one of the thirtythree renowned *sthāyas*. It is so named because it is appropriate in every melodic element and manner.